HUB-EP-99/26
DFPD 99/TH/25
hep–th/9906142

arXiv:hep-th/9906142v6 29 Jul 2002

Superbranes and Superembeddings

Dmitri Sorokin[†]

Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Mathematisch-Naturwissenshaftliche Fakultat,
Institut für Physik, Invalidenstrasse 110, D-10115 Berlin
and
Università Degli Studi Di Padova, Dipartimento Di Fisica "Galileo Galilei"
ed INFN, Sezione Di Padova
Via F. Marzolo, 8, 35131 Padova, Italia

Abstract

We review the geometrical approach to the description of the dynamics of superparticles, superstrings and, in general, of super–p–branes, Dirichlet branes and the M5-brane, which is based on a generalization of the elements of surface theory to the description of the embedding of supersurfaces into target superspaces.

Being manifestly supersymmetric in both, the superworldvolume of the brane and the target superspace, this approach unifies the Neveu–Schwarz–Ramond and the Green–Schwarz formulation and provides the fermionic κ–symmetry of the Green–Schwarz–type superbrane actions with a clear geometrical meaning of standard worldvolume local supersymmetry.

The dynamics of superbranes is encoded in a generic superembedding condition.

Depending on the superbrane and the target–space dimension, the superembedding condition produces either only off–shell constraints (as in the case of $N = 1$ superparticles and $N = 1$ superstrings), or also results in the full set of the superbrane equations of motion (as, for example, in the case of the M–theory branes). In the first case worldvolume superspace actions for the superbranes can be constructed, while in the second case only component or generalized superfield actions are known.

We describe the properties of the doubly supersymmetric brane actions and show how they are related to the standard Green–Schwarz formulation.

In the second part of the article basic geometrical grounds of the (super)embedding approach are considered and applied to the description of the M2–brane and the M5–brane. Various applications of the superembedding approach are reviewed.

[†]Alexander von Humboldt Fellow. On leave from Kharkov Institute of Physics and Technology, Kharkov, 310108, Ukraine

Contents

1 Introduction **4**

2 Doubly supersymmetric particles **12**

2.1 The bosonic particle . . . 12
2.2 Spinning particles . . . 13
2.3 Superparticles, κ-symmetry . . . 15
2.4 Spinning superparticles . . . 18
2.5 Worldline superfield actions for standard superparticles. The superembedding condition. . . . 20
2.5.1 $N = 1, D = 3$ superparticle and twistors . . . 20
2.5.2 On–shell relationship between superparticles and spinning particles 25
2.5.3 The superembedding condition . . . 27
2.5.4 $N = 1$, $D = 4, 6, 10$ superparticles . . . 28
2.6 Coupling to supersymmetric Maxwell fields . . . 38
2.7 Superembedding into curved superspaces . . . 41

3 Superstrings **42**

3.1 Green–Schwarz formulation . . . 42
3.2 Doubly supersymmetric $N = 1$ superstrings . . . 46
3.2.1 Null superstrings . . . 50
3.2.2 String tension generating mechanism . . . 52
3.2.3 Weil triviality . . . 53
3.2.4 Worldsheet superfield action . . . 55
3.3 Coupling to supergravity background . . . 56
3.4 Heterotic fermions . . . 57
3.5 Type II superstrings . . . 60

4 Basic elements of (super)surface theory **61**

4.1 Bosonic embedding . . . 61
4.2 Superembedding . . . 67
4.3 κ–symmetry from the point of view of superembedding . . . 74
4.4 $N = 1, D = 10$ superparticles and superstrings from the general perspective of superembedding . . . 76

5 M–theory branes **78**

5.1 The supermembrane . . . 80
5.1.1 The fermionic equation . . . 82
5.1.2 The bosonic equation . . . 84
5.1.3 Main superembedding equations for the M2–brane . . . 86

5.2 The super–5–brane 87
5.2.1 The tensor field equation 90
5.2.2 The fermionic equation 92
5.2.3 The scalar equation 94
5.2.4 Main superembedding equations for the M5–brane 96

6 Other developments and applications **97**
6.1 The generalized action principle 97
6.2 D–branes, L–branes and branes ending on branes 99
6.3 Nonlinear realizations and superembeddings 100

7 Concluding remarks and outlook **103**

1 Introduction

String theory to much more extent than any other theory requires for its description various important developments of classical and quantum field theory, group theory, geometry and topology.

To comprehend different properties of string theory and to uncover underlying relations between them one should use for the analysis different (often intertwined) mathematical tools and methods.

One of such basic geometrical tools is surface theory which describes the embedding of surfaces into higher dimensional manifolds. The application of surface theory to the description of string theory is quite natural, since the string is a one–dimensional relativistic object which sweeps a two–dimensional surface (worldsheet) when it propagates in a (target) space–time. The dynamics of the string completely determines the geometrical properties of the worldsheet describing its embedding into the target space, and vice versa, specifying geometrical properties of the embedding of a surface into a target space one can, in principle, get the full information about the details of the dynamics of a string whose worldsheet is associated with this surface.

For instance, a metric $g_{mn}(\xi)$ $(m, n = 0, 1)$ of a string worldsheet locally parametrized by coordinates $\xi^m = (\tau, \sigma)$ is an induced metric which is related to a D–dimensional target–space metric $g_{\underline{mn}}(X)$ $(\underline{m}, \underline{n} = 0, 1, ..., D-1)$ through the condition [†]

$$g_{mn}(\xi) = \partial_m X^{\underline{m}} g_{\underline{mn}}(X(\xi)) \partial_n X^{\underline{n}}, \tag{1.1}$$

which is the simplest example of the embedding condition.

Note that with taking into account worldsheet reparametrization symmetry the induced metric condition (1.1) amounts to Virasoro constraints on string dynamics (see [1, 2, 3] for details on superstring theory).

The classical trajectories of the string are surfaces of a minimal (or more generally, extremal) area. This follows from the Nambu–Goto string action

$$S = -T \int d^2\xi \sqrt{-\det g_{mn}(X(\xi))}, \tag{1.2}$$

whose geometrical meaning is to be the total area of the worldsheet of a string with the tension T. The variation of the action (1.2) vanishes for minimal area surfaces, which produces the string equations of motion. Therefore, from the geometrical point of view the string equations describe minimal (area) embedding of the worldsheet into target space.

A direct application of the geometrical methods of surface theory in string theory was initiated in [4, 5] and revealed a connection of the string equations of motion with two–

[†]In what follows the underlined indices will correspond to target–space objects (coordinates, fields, etc.), while not underlined indices will correspond to the worldsurface. This will allow us to escape, to some extent, the proliferation of indices.

dimensional (exactly solvable) non–linear equations, such as the sin–Gordon and Liouville equation.

Though, of course, all string formulations imply that string worldsheet is a surface embedded into a target space–time, the geometrical embedding approach explores this in the most direct way. It deals with such objects as induced vielbeins of the surface, extrinsic curvature and torsion of the surface, and reduces the string equations to the system of the Codazzi, Gauss and Ricci equations completely determining the embedding of the surface (see [7] for the details on surface theory and [6] on its applications to strings).

The embedding approach was also used in connection with the problem of formulating a consistent quantum string theory in non–critical space–time dimensions and has been developed in a number of papers (see [6, 8] and references therein).

In addition to particles and strings a variety of other extended relativistic objects have been discovered in $D = 10$ superstring theories and $D = 11$ supergravity. This includes a $D = 11$ membrane [9], a $D = 11$ five–brane [10] and Dirichlet branes [11, 12]. Collectively all these extended objects are called superbranes or super–p–branes, where p denotes the number of spatial dimensions of a given brane.

The existence of the superbranes reflects and causes important duality chains which connect $D = 11$ supergravity with five basic $D = 10$ superstring theories and string theories among themselves (see [13, 3] for a review on dualities). This gives rise to a conjecture that $D = 11$ supergravity and the $D = 10$ string theories can be associated with different vacua of a single underling quantum theory called U–theory [14]. This theory is also often called M–theory [16], but following Sen [14] and Schwarz [15] we shall reserve the latter name for a $D = 11$ sector of U–theory whose low energy effective field theory limit is $D = 11$ supergravity, and which also contains a membrane (M2–brane) and a five–brane (M5–brane) as part of its physical spectrum.

Since the superbranes are surfaces in target superspaces it is natural to apply for studying their properties the same geometrical methods as for strings, i.e. to describe the propagation of superbranes by specifying the embedding of brane worldvolumes in target superspaces. For instance, a bosonic part of a super–p–brane worldvolume action is a $(p+1)$–dimensional analog of the Nambu–Goto action (1.2). It produces bosonic equations of motion which are equivalent to minimal (volume) embedding of the corresponding worldvolume into space–time.

As we have already mentioned, at the classical level the use of geometrical embedding methods allow one to find a connection between equations of motion of bosonic branes and integrable [17], and in the case of strings, with exactly solvable nonlinear equations [4, 5, 6, 8, 20]. Analogous relations were also found for superstrings [21, 22]. As a result, one can relate, for example, (super)strings to exactly–solvable Wess–Zumino–Novikov–Witten models [23, 24, 22]. (for a review on WZNW models and related topics see

[25, 26] and references therein). This provides us with useful information about the details of brane dynamics.

In the case of supersymmetric extended objects the use of the embedding approach has turned out to be even more fruitful, since it has allowed one to clarify the geometrical origin of local symmetries of superbrane worldvolumes [27]–[45], to relate different formulations of superbrane dynamics [46]–[49], and to get equations of motion for those superbranes for which the construction of worldvolume actions encountered problems, such as D(irichlet)-branes [50] and the M5-brane [51]. It has also allowed one to make a progress towards a solution of the problem of covariant quantization of superstrings [53, 33, 48, 54, 140, 55]. Let us also mention that supergravity can also be described as a theory of supersurfaces [56].

To apply the embedding approach to the description of superbranes one should first generalize the method itself and find supersymmetric analogs of bosonic embedding conditions such as the induced metric condition (1.1) and the minimal embedding of the superbrane worldvolume which would be equivalent to the superbrane equations of motion [45]. A reasonable generalization is to consider superbrane worldvolumes as *super*surfaces locally parametrized by $(p+1)$ bosonic coordinates ξ^m and n fermionic coordinates η^μ $(\mu = 1, ..., n)$ embedded (in a specific way) into target *super*spaces locally parametrized by D bosonic coordinates $X^{\underline{m}}$ and $2^{[\frac{D}{2}]}$ Grassmann spinor coordinates $\Theta^{\underline{\mu}}$ (where brackets denote the integer part of $\frac{D}{2}$). Thus we get a superembedding.

The assumption that such a superembedding should underlie the worldvolume dynamics of superbranes is prompted by a well known fact that the $D = 10$ superstring theories can be formulated in two different ways.

In the Neveu–Schwarz–Ramond (or spinning string) formulation [57] superstring propagation is described by a supersurface, possessing $n = 1$ local worldsheet supersymmetry, embedded into bosonic space–time. Space–time supersymmetry appears in this model only upon quantization as a symmetry of quantum string physical states singled out by the Gliozzi–Scherk–Olive projection [59].

On the other hand in the Green–Schwarz formulation [58] the superstring worldsheet is a bosonic surface embedded into a target superspace. This formulation is manifestly space–time supersymmetric and, in addition, possesses a local worldsheet fermionic symmetry called kappa–symmetry. The number of independent κ–symmetry transformations is half the number of target superspace Grassmann coordinates. Kappa–symmetry was first observed in the case of superparticles [60, 61] and is inherent to all superbranes in the Green–Schwarz formulation [1, 9, 62, 63, 64]. It plays an important role ensuring that superbranes form stable, so called, Bogomol'nyi–Prasad–Sommerfeld configurations whose presence in a superspace background preserves half of the space–time supersymmetries of a background vacuum. For $D = 10$ superstrings this means, in particular, that their quantization results in consistent quantum supersymmetric theories.

At the same time local fermionic κ–symmetry causes problems with performing the covariant Hamiltonian analysis and quantization of superbrane theories. This is due to the fact that the first–class constraints corresponding to κ–symmetry form an infinite reducible set, and in a conventional formulation of superparticles and superstrings it turned out impossible to single out an irreducible set of the fermionic first–class constraints in a Lorentz covariant way. (Note however that it is possible to do this in the case of D–branes [65]).

It is therefore desirable to replace κ–symmetry with something more natural and simple. To do this one can notice that κ–symmetry transformations resemble supersymmetry transformations. Space–time supersymmetry transformations of $X^{\underline{m}}$ and $\Theta^{\underline{\mu}}$ with a supersymmetry parameter $\epsilon^{\underline{\mu}}$ are

$$\delta\Theta^{\underline{\mu}} = \epsilon^{\underline{\mu}}, \qquad \delta X^{\underline{m}} = i\bar{\Theta}\Gamma^{\underline{m}}\delta\Theta, \tag{1.3}$$

while κ–symmetry transformations of $X^{\underline{m}}$ and $\Theta^{\underline{\mu}}$ on the superbrane worldvolume have the following form

$$\delta\Theta^{\underline{\mu}}(\xi) = \frac{1}{2}(1+\bar{\Gamma})^{\underline{\mu}}{}_{\underline{\nu}}\kappa^{\underline{\nu}}(\xi), \qquad \delta X^{\underline{m}}(\xi) = -i\bar{\Theta}\Gamma^{\underline{m}}\delta\Theta, \quad (\bar{\Gamma})^2 = 1 \tag{1.4}$$

where $\frac{1}{2}(1+\bar{\Gamma})$ is a projection operator constructed from the $\Gamma^{\underline{m}}$ matrices. The projector is specific for each type of the superbranes, and its presence implies that the number of independent κ–symmetry transformations is twice less than the number of the space–time supersymmetries (1.3).

Notice the difference in the sign of the $X^{\underline{m}}$–variations in (1.3) and (1.4). This difference implies that if ordinary supersymmetry is associated with left boosts in the target superspace, the κ–symmetry is associated with right boosts.

It is instructive to understand how the presence of the branes breaks symmetries of target superspace vacua. For this consider an infinite flat membrane in a $D = 11$ Minkowski superspace.

i) $D = 11$ Lorenz symmetry $SO(1,10)$ is broken down to $d = 3$ Lorentz symmetry $SO(1,2)$ of the worldvolume times $SO(8)$ rotations in directions orthogonal to the membrane;

ii) $D = 11$ Poincare invariance is broken down to a translational symmetry along the membrane worldvolume (generated by momenta P_m, m=0,1,2),

iii) therefore, unbroken supersymmetries are those generated by supercharges whose anticommutators close on the unbroken translations along the membrane worldvolume. There are 16 such generators Q_α (α=1,...,16) among 32.

$$\{Q, Q\} = 2iP_m\Gamma^m.$$

16 target–superspace Grassmann coordinates (let us call them η^α) which are shifted by the action of the 16 unbroken supercharges can be regarded as ones 'parallel' to the membrane.

It is important to stress that it is the *unbroken* supersymmetry transformations of η^α which can be compensated by appropriate worldvolume κ–symmetry transformations, and, hence, these 16 Grassmann coordinates can be associated with fermionic directions which extend the bosonic worldvolume of the membrane to a superspace embedded into the target superspace. Other 16 target–space Grassmann coordinates (let us call them $\theta^{\alpha'}$) correspond to the spontaneously broken supersymmetries. They are Goldstone fermion physical modes of the brane.

From the above analogy we see that, since κ–symmetry is a local worldvolume fermionic symmetry, it would be natural to endow it with the direct meaning of being a manifestation of conventional n–extended local supersymmetry of the superbrane worldvolume. This would allow one to get rid of 'unpleasant' features of κ–symmetry by dealing directly with well understood properties of conventional linearly realized supersymmetry. Such an interpretation of κ–symmetry was proposed in [27].

For this one should construct a formulation of superbrane dynamics which would be manifestly supersymmetric on both the worldvolume and the target superspace. Such a doubly supersymmetric formulation would then unify the NSR and GS formulations. Note that the NSR formulation of super–branes with $p > 1$ is unknown and the doubly supersymmetric formulation may provide one with an idea what "spinning" branes might look like.

To have the worldvolume and target space supersymmetry manifest the doubly supersymmetric formulation should be constructed as a superfield theory on both the worldvolume superspace and the target superspace, the former being (super)embedded into the latter. We thus again arrive at the superembedding approach.

The idea to use doubly supersymmetric models for a combined treatment of the NSR and the GS superstrings first appeared in [66]. It has then been applied to the construction of an interesting class of so called spinning superparticle [67] and spinning superstring [68] models. In general, however, these models describe objects with twice larger number of physical states than, for example, corresponding NSR spinning strings or GS superstrings have themselves. They also do not resolve the problem of κ–symmetry, since the latter is still present in the spinning superbranes as an independent symmetry in addition to double supersymmetry.

A main reason why spinning superbranes have 'redundant' symmetries and physical states is that embedding of their superworldvolumes into target superspaces is too general. To describe conventional (i.e. not spinning) superbranes in the superembedding approach (with kappa–symmetry replaced by local worldvolume supersymmetry) one should find an appropriate superembedding condition which would amount to conditions required for the description of the dynamics of the 'standard' superbranes.

The basic superembedding condition was first found in [27] for superparticles and then, as a result of the development of the superembedding approach [27]–[51], was proved to

be generic to all known types of superbranes. From the geometrical point of view this condition is quite natural and simple.

Consider the pullback onto the superworldvolume (with $n = 2^{[\frac{D}{2}]-1}$ Grassmann directions) of the vector component $E^{\underline{a}}(Z)$ of a target space supervielbein $E^{\underline{M}}(Z) = (E^{\underline{a}}, E^{\underline{\alpha}})$ (where $Z^{\underline{M}} = (X^{\underline{m}}, \Theta^{\underline{\mu}})$, and the indices from the beginning of the alphabets correspond to the (co)tangent space of the target superspace which has $2n = 2^{[\frac{D}{2}]}$ Grassmann directions). The pullback of $E^{\underline{a}}$ is a one–superform on the superworldvolume and, therefore, can be expended in a superworldvolume supervielbein basis $e^A(\xi, \eta) = (e^a, e^\alpha)$

$$E^{\underline{a}}(Z(\xi, \eta)) = e^a E^{\underline{a}}_a + e^\alpha E^{\underline{a}}_\alpha. \tag{1.5}$$

The superembedding condition reads that the pullback components of the vector supervielbein $E^{\underline{a}}(Z)$ along the Grassmann directions of the superworldvolume are zero

$$E^{\underline{a}}_\alpha(Z(\xi, \eta)) = 0. \tag{1.6}$$

The geometrical meaning of this condition is that at any point on the superworldvolume the worldvolume tangent space Grassmann directions form a subspace of the Grassmann tangent space of the target superspace.

In a certain sense eq. (1.6) is analogous to the induced metric condition (1.1) (actually, eq. (1.6) implies a superspace generalization of (1.1)). As we shall see below, the dynamical meaning of the superembedding condition (1.6) is that it produces Virasoro–like constraints on the dynamics of the superbranes, and in many cases its integrability conditions lead to superbrane equations of motion. It also provides a link between κ–symmetry of the standard GS formulation and local worldvolume supersymmetry of the doubly supersymmetric formulation of superbranes [27], as well as a classical relation between the NSR and GS formulation in the case of superparticles [46, 47] and superstrings [48, 49].

In the cases when the superembedding condition does not produce the superbrane equations of motion one can construct worldvolume superfield actions for corresponding superbranes. Such actions have been constructed for $N = 1$, [†] $D = 3, 4, 6, 10$ massless superparticles [27, 31, 32, 36, 38, 39], $N = 1$, $D = 3, 4, 6, 10$ superstrings [28, 29, 33, 34, 37, 40], $N = 2$, $D = 2, 3, 4, 6$ massless and massive superparticles [35, 38, 42, 69], an $N = 2$, $D = 3$ superstring [41, 42] and an $N = 1$, $D = 4$ supermembrane [70].

In the case where worldvolume superembedding corresponds to the type II $D = 10$ superstrings and D–branes, the $D = 11$ supermembrane and the super–five–brane the superembedding condition produces superbrane equations of motion [42, 45, 50, 51]. It is remarkable that in such cases the superembedding condition contains full information about the physical contents of supersymmetric theories on the worldvolumes of the superbranes. For instance, in the case of the D-branes one derives from (1.6) that the D–branes

[†]The capital N stands for the number of the spinorial supercharges of target–space supersymmetry.

carry on their worldvolumes vector gauge fields of the Dirac–Born–Infeld–type, and the M5–brane carries a self–dual second–rank tensor gauge field. The superembedding approach allowed one to get the full set of nonlinear equations of motion of D–branes [50] and the M5–brane [51, 52] before the Green–Schwarz–type worldvolume actions for these objects were constructed in [62, 63, 64] †.

When the superembedding condition produces superbrane equations of motion one cannot construct worldvolume superfield actions for these branes. The problem is the same as in the case of extended supersymmetric field theories and supergravities when constraints imposed on superfields put the theory on the mass shell. In these cases one should either consider component actions (such as Green–Schwarz–type actions), or apply a generalized action principle [72] based on a group–manifold approach to the description of supersymmetric theories [73]. In the latter case one gets an action which produces the superfield superembedding condition as an equation of motion, though the action itself is not a fully fledged superfield action in the sense that the integral is taken only over a bosonic submanifold of the superworldvolume.

In some cases the superembedding condition is not enough even for the off–shell descriptions of superbranes [50]. This happens, for instance, with D6– and D8–branes of the type IIA superstring theory [74] or with space–filling branes, such as the D9–brane of the type IIB superstring [75]. In these cases an additional superworldvolume condition is required to constrain superfields describing gauge fields propagating in the worldvolume of the branes.

As another important and profound feature of the superembedding approach it is worth mentioning that it provides a natural link between space–time and twistor [76, 77] description of relativistic systems. Actually, in the first series of papers on the doubly supersymmetric description of superbranes the approach was called twistor–like, and only quite recently it has acquired the present name of the geometrical [45, 78] or simply the superembedding [79] approach.

In the superembedding approach auxiliary commuting spinors appear as superpartners of the target superspace Grassmann coordinates and have properties of twistors [76, 77, 80, 27] and/or Lorentz harmonics [87],[88]–[94, 53].

The use of twistor–like variables to formulate the theory of supersymmetric relativistic objects has the following deep grounds.

When a superbrane propagates in a nontrivial gauge superfield or supergravity background κ–symmetry requires background superfields to satisfy superfield constraints, which (in most of the cases) are equivalent to background superfield equations of motion.

For instance, the κ–symmetry of a massless superparticle propagating in a super–

†A gauge fixed action for a space–filling D3–brane was first constructed in [71] as a result of studying partial breaking of $N = 2$, $D = 4$ supersymmetry.

Yang–Mills background requires geometrical integrability of the background along light–like lines of the superparticle trajectories, which implies constraints on background superfields. In the case of $N = 3, 4$, $D = 4$ or $N = 1$, $D = 10$ super–Yang–Mills background, for example, this is equivalent to the SYM field equations [95, 96]. Analogous results were obtained for supergravity backgrounds [95, 97]. And it was understood that the correspondence between geometrical integrability along massless superparticle orbits and super–Yang–Mills and supergravity equations is based on a twistor interpretation of these theories. In this connection twistor formulations of superparticles and superstrings have been studied in a number of papers [80, 81]–[86, 97, 30, 38, 54, 98, 99, 100].

As we shall see, the superembedding condition (1.6) contains a Cartan–Penrose relation between vectors and commuting spinors. And the Cartan–Penrose relation turns out to be the twistor–like solution of the Virasoro–type constraints which govern the dynamics of any brane.

Therefore, through the superembedding condition one establishes the relationship between various space–time, twistor–like and harmonic formulations of superparticles, superstrings and superbranes.

In this review we shall consider basic features of the superembedding approach. We shall show how one arrives at the superembedding condition by constructing an appropriate worldline superfield action for a massless superparticle. We shall demonstrate how local worldvolume supersymmetry transformations reduce to κ–symmetry transformations upon the elimination of the auxiliary components of worldvolume superfields which made local supersymmetry manifest. For those superbranes for which the superembedding condition does not put the theory on the mass shell we shall present doubly supersymmetric (worldvolume superfield) actions which produce the superembedding condition, and will discuss their symmetry properties.

We shall perform the analysis of the superembedding condition in cases when it puts the theory on–shell producing superbrane equations of motion. In these cases, such as the $D = 11$ M2–brane and the M5–brane, we shall demonstrate how superbrane equations of motion arise as a requirement of the integrability of the superembedding condition, and will discuss the problem of constructing doubly supersymmetric actions for such branes.

Since the (super)embedding approach has a rather wide range of applications, it is not possible in one review to cover in detail all points where this approach has been found to be useful. Some of them we shall just sketch referring the reader to corresponding original literature. For instance, we leave aside the relation of the method to integrable models, and an important and interesting problem of covariant quantization of Green–Schwarz superstrings, which itself requires a separate review article. The details on solving this problem with methods related to the superembedding approach the reader may find in [54, 33, 48, 140, 53, 55].

The article is organized as follows.

It can be conventionally divided into two parts. The first part consists of Sections 2 and 3, and Sections 4 and 5 constitute the second part.

In Section 2 we introduce the basic ideas of the superembedding approach with a simple example of superparticles. This instructive example should facilitate the reader's understanding of all the features, ingredients and techniques of the approach, which will be applied (in exactly the same way) in subsequent Sections to the description of more complicated models of superstrings and superbranes.

In Section 3 we discuss the superembedding formulation of $N = 1$, $D = 3, 4, 6, 10$ superstrings. As in the case of $N = 1$, $D = 3, 4, 6, 10$ superparticles, the superembedding condition does not produce dynamical equations of motion of the $N = 1$ superstrings, and one can construct worldsheet superfield actions, from which the dynamical equations are derived. An interesting feature of these actions is that the string tension appears there through an auxiliary dynamical variable [40]. This is a realization of the idea of a dynamical generation of the brane tension, various aspects of which have been discussed in references [101, 102, 103]. We then describe worldsheet superfield actions for $N = 1$ superstrings in curved target superspaces and show that the latter should obey supergravity constraints. Finally, we introduce into the doubly supersymmetric construction chiral (heterotic) fermions which extend the $N = 1$, $D = 10$ closed superstring to a $D = 10$ heterotic string.

In Section 4 we present basic geometrical ideas which underlie the theory of bosonic surfaces and then extend them to the description of superembeddings.

In Section 5 we apply general tools of superembeddings to the description of classical dynamics of the supermembrane and the super–5–brane of M–theory.

In Section 6 we briefly review other applications of the superembedding approach.

2 Doubly supersymmetric particles

2.1 The bosonic particle

We start by recalling the form of actions for a massless bosonic particle which we will then subject to various kinds of supersymmetrization. This will allow us to describe the dynamics of particles having spin degrees of freedom.

A well known quadratic action for the massless bosonic particle propagating in D–dimensional Minkowski space is

$$S = \int d\tau L(x, \dot{x}, e) = \int d\tau \frac{1}{2e(\tau)} \dot{x}^{\underline{m}} \dot{x}^{\underline{n}} \eta_{\underline{mn}}, \tag{2.1}$$

where $\eta_{\underline{mn}}$ is the diagonal Minkowski metric $(-, +, ..., +)$, τ is the time variable parametrizing a particle worldline $x^{\underline{m}}(\tau)$ ($\underline{m} = 0, 1..., D-1$) in the target space–time, $\dot{x}^{\underline{m}} \equiv \partial_\tau x^{\underline{m}}$ and $e(\tau)$ is an auxiliary field which can be regarded as a (nondynamical) gravitational field on

the worldline of the particle. The latter ensures the invariance of the action (2.1) under worldline reparametrizations (diffeomorphisms) $\tau' = f(\tau)$, the worldline fields $x^{\underline{m}}(\tau)$ and $e(\tau)$ transforming as scalars and a one–dimensional covariant vector, respectively,

$$x'^{\underline{m}}(\tau') = x^{\underline{m}}(\tau), \qquad e'(\tau') = \frac{d\tau}{d\tau'}e(\tau) = \frac{1}{\dot{f}(\tau)}e(\tau). \tag{2.2}$$

The consequence of the reparametrization invariance is the constraint on the dynamics of the particle

$$\frac{1}{e^2}\dot{x}^{\underline{m}}\dot{x}_{\underline{m}} = 0,$$

or

$$p^{\underline{m}}p_{\underline{m}} = 0, \tag{2.3}$$

which is obtained by varying (2.1) with respect to $e(\tau)$. In eq. (2.3) $p_{\underline{m}} = \frac{\delta L}{\delta \dot{x}^{\underline{m}}} = \frac{1}{e}\dot{x}^{\underline{m}}$ is the canonical momentum of the particle.

The constraint (2.3) implies that the particle is massless.

Using the canonical momentum variable $p_{\underline{m}}(\tau)$ we can rewrite the action (2.1) in the first order form

$$S = \int d\tau (p_{\underline{m}}\dot{x}^{\underline{m}} - \frac{e}{2}p_{\underline{m}}p^{\underline{m}}). \tag{2.4}$$

We will now generalize both versions of the massless particle action to describe various supersymmetric particles.

2.2 Spinning particles

Let us assume that the trajectory of a particle in a bosonic space–time is not a line but a supersurface parametrized by one bosonic variable τ and one fermionic variable η (which can be regarded as a one-dimensional worldline spinor). The functions $X^{\underline{m}}(\tau, \eta)$ describing the embedding of this supersurface into D-dimensional bosonic target space become worldline superfields

$$X^{\underline{m}}(\tau, \eta) = x^{\underline{m}}(\tau) + i\eta\chi^{\underline{m}}(\tau), \tag{2.5}$$

where, as above, $x^{\underline{m}}(\tau)$ are the coordinates of the particle in the target space and $\chi^{\underline{m}}$ are their Grassmann–odd superpartners.[†]

The one–dimensional graviton $e(\tau)$ becomes a member of a (supergravity) superfield

$$E(\tau, \eta) = e(\tau) + 2i\eta\psi(\tau) \tag{2.6}$$

and thus acquires a gravitino field $\psi(\tau)$ as its Grassmann–odd superpartner.

[†]In (2.5) and below capital letters stand for worldvolume superfields, while corresponding small letters denote leading components of these superfields which are associated with conventional dynamical variables of the superbranes.

The particle momentum $p_{\underline{m}}$ enters a superfield

$$P_{\underline{m}}(\tau,\eta) = p_{\underline{m}}(\tau) + i\eta\rho_{\underline{m}}(\tau). \tag{2.7}$$

To get an action for a spinning superparticle one can supersymmetrize both the action (2.1) or its first–order form (2.4). Since the generalization of the latter is more sophisticated [104] we shall not describe it below.

The action (2.1) is generalized to a superworldline integral as follows [105]

$$S = -\int d\tau d\eta \frac{i}{2E} DX^{\underline{m}} \partial_\tau X_{\underline{m}} = -\int d\tau d\eta \frac{1}{2E} DX^{\underline{m}} D(DX_{\underline{m}}), \tag{2.8}$$

where

$$D = \frac{\partial}{\partial\eta} + i\eta\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau}, \qquad D^2 = \frac{1}{2}\{D,D\} = i\partial_\tau \tag{2.9}$$

is a Grassmann covariant derivative.

The action (2.8) is invariant under local worldline superreparametrizations which include bosonic worldline reparametrizations and local supersymmetry transformations. The infinitesimal superreparametrizations are

$$\begin{aligned} \tau' - \tau &= \delta\tau = \Lambda(\tau,\eta) - \tfrac{1}{2}\eta D\Lambda, \\ \eta' - \eta &= \delta\eta = -\tfrac{i}{2} D\Lambda, \\ D' - D &= \delta D = -\tfrac{1}{2}\dot{\Lambda} D, \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

where $\Lambda(\tau,\eta) = a(\tau) + i\eta\alpha(\tau)$ is the superreparametrization parameter which contains the worldline bosonic reparametrization parameter $a(\tau)$ and the local supersymmetry parameter $\alpha(\tau)$. Under (2.10) the superfield $X^{\underline{m}}(\tau,\eta)$ (2.5) transforms as a scalar $X'^{\underline{m}}(\tau',\eta') = X^{\underline{m}}(\tau,\eta)$, its components having the following variation properties ($\delta X^{\underline{m}} \equiv X'^{\underline{m}}(\tau,\eta) - X^{\underline{m}}(\tau,\eta)$)

$$\begin{aligned} \delta x^{\underline{m}} &= -a(\tau)\dot{x}^{\underline{m}} - \frac{i}{2}\alpha(\tau)\chi^{\underline{m}}, \\ \delta\chi^{\underline{m}} &= -a(\tau)\dot{\chi}^{\underline{m}} - \frac{1}{2}\dot{a}(\tau)\chi^{\underline{m}} - \frac{1}{2}\alpha(\tau)\dot{x}^{\underline{m}}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

The superfield $P_{\underline{m}}(\tau,\eta)$ also transforms as a scalar $P'_{\underline{m}}(\tau',\eta') = P_{\underline{m}}(\tau,\eta)$

$$\begin{aligned} \delta p_{\underline{m}} &= -a(\tau)\dot{p}_{\underline{m}} - \frac{i}{2}\alpha(\tau)\rho_{\underline{m}}, \\ \delta\rho_{\underline{m}} &= -a(\tau)\dot{\rho}_{\underline{m}} - \frac{1}{2}\dot{a}(\tau)\rho_{\underline{m}} - \frac{1}{2}\alpha(\tau)\dot{p}_{\underline{m}}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

Finally, the transformation properties of the superfield $E(\tau,\eta)$ are

$$\delta E = -\partial_\tau(\Lambda E) + \frac{i}{2} D\Lambda DE, \tag{2.13}$$

from which one derives the variation of the worldline graviton $e(\tau)$ and the gravitino $\psi(\tau)$

$$\begin{aligned} \delta e &= -\partial_\tau(ae) - i\alpha(\tau)\psi, \\ \delta\psi &= -a(\tau)\dot{\psi} - \tfrac{3}{2}\dot{a}\psi - \tfrac{1}{4}\alpha(\tau)\dot{e} - \tfrac{1}{2}\dot{\alpha}(\tau)e. \end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

Let us note that the geometry of the superworldline associated with the superreparametrizations defined in eq. (2.10) is conformally flat. This means that worldline supervielbeins $e^A(\tau,\eta) = (e^\tau, e^\eta)$ describing such a geometry differ from flat supervielbeins $e_0^A(\tau,\eta) = (e_0^\tau, e_0^\eta = d\eta)$ by a conformal factor (the subscript 0 indicates the flat basis). Namely,

$$e^\tau = E(\tau,\eta)e_0^\tau = E(\tau,\eta)(d\tau + i\eta d\eta),$$

$$e^\eta = E^{\frac{1}{2}}(\tau,\eta)d\eta - ie_0^\tau D E^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{2.15}$$

(Note that as in the flat case such a form of the supervielbein satisfies the worldline torsion constraint $T^\tau \equiv de^\tau = -ie^\eta \wedge e^\eta$.)

In the case of the conformally flat worldline supergeometry (and a corresponding worldsheet supergeometry of superstrings) it is convenient to use flat supercovariant derivatives (2.10) and supervielbeins rather than curved ones and just take into account conformal factors where they are required for the covariance.

Integrating (2.8) over η (using the Grassmann integration rules $\int d\eta = 0$ and $\int d\eta\eta = 1$) we get the component action

$$S = \int d\tau \left[\frac{1}{2e}(\dot{x}^{\underline{m}}\dot{x}_{\underline{m}} + i\dot{\chi}^{\underline{m}}\chi_{\underline{m}}) - \frac{i}{e^2}\psi\chi_{\underline{m}}\dot{x}^{\underline{m}}\right]. \tag{2.16}$$

In addition to the 'masslessness' constraint (2.3) the action (2.16) yields the fermionic constraint which comes from the variation of the last term in (2.16) with respect to $\psi(\tau)$

$$\chi^{\underline{m}}p_{\underline{m}} = 0, \tag{2.17}$$

where now the canonical momentum is

$$p_{\underline{m}} = \frac{1}{e}(\dot{x}_{\underline{m}} - \frac{i}{e}\psi\chi_{\underline{m}}). \tag{2.18}$$

(Note that since $\chi_{\underline{m}}$ are Grassmann–odd, $\chi_{\underline{m}}\chi^{\underline{m}} \equiv 0$).

Upon quantization the constraint (2.17) becomes the Dirac equation imposed on a first–quantized spinorial wave function. Therefore, the action (2.3) or (2.16) describes a relativistic particle with spin 1/2, and the Grassmann vector $\chi^{\underline{m}}$ describes the spinning degrees of freedom of the particle [106, 105].

To get an action for relativistic particles of an arbitrary spin $\frac{n}{2}$ (where n is a natural number) one should consider the worldline of a particle to be a supersurface parametrized by n fermionic variables η^q $(q = 1, ..., n)$ [107, 108].

2.3 Superparticles, κ-symmetry

Let us now do an opposite thing. Instead of considering the embedding of a worldline supersurface into a bosonic D–dimensional space–time consider an embedding of a bosonic worldline into a flat target superspace parametrized by bosonic coordinates $x^{\underline{m}}$ ($\underline{m}$ =

$0, 1, ..., D-1$) and Grassmann spinor coordinates $\theta^{\underline{\mu}}$ ($\underline{\mu} = 1, ..., 2^{[\frac{D}{2}]}$). Depending on the dimension D the spinors θ can be chosen to be Dirac, Majorana or Majorana–Weyl ones.

The global supersymmetry transformations of the target superspace coordinates are

$$\delta\theta^{\underline{\mu}} = \epsilon^{\underline{\mu}}, \qquad \delta x^{\underline{m}} = i\bar{\theta}\Gamma^{\underline{m}}\delta\theta, \tag{2.19}$$

and we would like to construct an action for a particle which would be invariant under these transformations.

For the construction of such an action one uses supercovariant one–forms $\mathcal{E}^{\underline{A}} = (\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}, \mathcal{E}^{\underline{\alpha}})$ which form an orthogonal supervielbein basis in the flat target superspace

$$\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}} = \left(dx^{\underline{m}} - id\bar{\theta}\Gamma^{\underline{m}}\theta\right)\delta^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{m}}, \quad \mathcal{E}^{\underline{\alpha}} = d\theta^{\underline{\mu}}\delta^{\underline{\alpha}}_{\underline{\mu}}, \tag{2.20}$$

The target superspace geometry is flat, i.e. it has zero curvature, but nonzero torsion (the external differential acts from the right)

$$\mathcal{T}^{\underline{a}} = d\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}} = -id\bar{\theta}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}d\theta. \tag{2.21}$$

[When superspaces are flat we shall usually not make a distinction between tangent–space 'flat' indices (from the beginning of the alphabets) and coordinate indices (from the middle of the alphabets), since in this case the two types of indices are simply related by the unit matrix, as in the definition of the supervielbeins (2.20).]

The pullback of the supervielbeins (2.20) onto the particle worldline with the image $Z^{\underline{M}}(\tau) = (x^{\underline{m}}(\tau), \theta^{\underline{\mu}}(\tau))$ is

$$\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}(Z(\tau)) = d\tau\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{\tau}(Z(\tau)) = d\tau\left(\partial_\tau x^{\underline{a}} - i\partial_\tau\bar{\theta}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\theta\right), \tag{2.22}$$

$$\mathcal{E}^{\underline{\alpha}}(Z(\tau)) = d\tau\partial_\tau\theta^{\underline{\alpha}}(\tau).$$

The superparticle action is obtained by replacing $\dot{x}^{\underline{m}}$ in (2.1) or (2.4) with the vector component $\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{\tau}$ of the supervielbein pullback (2.22). Thus we get [109, 110, 111]

$$S = \int d\tau \frac{1}{2e(\tau)}\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{\tau}\mathcal{E}^{\underline{b}}_{\tau}\eta_{\underline{ab}}, \tag{2.23}$$

or in the first order form

$$S = \int d\tau (p_{\underline{a}}\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{\tau} - \frac{e}{2}p_{\underline{a}}p^{\underline{a}}). \tag{2.24}$$

The superparticle equations of motion derived from (2.23) or (2.24) are

$$\partial_\tau(\frac{1}{e(\tau)}\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{\tau}) = \partial_\tau p^{\underline{a}} = 0, \quad (\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{\tau}\Gamma_{\underline{a}})^{\underline{\alpha}}{}_{\underline{\beta}}\partial_\tau\theta^{\underline{\beta}} = (p^{\underline{a}}\Gamma_{\underline{a}})^{\underline{\alpha}}{}_{\underline{\beta}}\partial_\tau\theta^{\underline{\beta}} = 0, \tag{2.25}$$

$$\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{\tau} = \partial_\tau x^{\underline{a}} - i\partial_\tau\bar{\theta}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\theta = e(\tau)p_{\underline{a}}.$$

.

By construction the actions (2.23) and (2.24) are invariant under the target–space supersymmetry transformations (2.19), and under the worldline reparametrization of $x^{\underline{m}}$, $e(\tau)$ (2.2), $p'_{\underline{m}}(\tau') = p_{\underline{m}}(\tau)$ and $\theta'(\tau') = \theta(\tau)$, which is responsible for the mass–shell condition (2.3). In addition, these actions possess a hidden worldline fermionic κ–symmetry [60, 61]. The κ–transformations of the worldline fields are

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\kappa \theta^{\underline{\mu}} &= i(p_{\underline{m}}\Gamma^{\underline{m}})^{\underline{\mu}}{}_{\underline{\nu}}\kappa^{\underline{\nu}}(\tau), \\ \delta_\kappa x^{\underline{m}} &= -i\bar{\theta}\Gamma^{\underline{m}}\delta_\kappa\theta \quad \Rightarrow \quad i_\kappa \mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}} \equiv \delta Z^{\underline{M}} \mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{M}} = 0, \\ \delta_\kappa e &= 4\dot{\bar{\theta}}\kappa, \\ \delta_\kappa p_{\underline{m}} &= 0, \end{aligned} \tag{2.26}$$

where $\kappa^{\underline{\mu}}(\tau)$ is a Grassmann spinor parameter of the κ–transformations.

One can notice that not all $\kappa^{\underline{\mu}}(\tau)$ contribute to the κ–transformations, and that, in fact, the transformations (2.26) are infinitely reducible.

Consider a particular choice of $\kappa^{\underline{\mu}}(\tau)$ when

$$\kappa^{\underline{\mu}}(\tau) = i(p_{\underline{m}}\Gamma^{\underline{m}})^{\underline{\mu}}{}_{\underline{\nu}}\kappa'^{\underline{\nu}}(\tau). \tag{2.27}$$

Then, due to the defining relations for the Dirac matrices

$$\{\Gamma^{\underline{m}}, \Gamma^{\underline{n}}\} = \Gamma^{\underline{m}}\Gamma^{\underline{n}} + \Gamma^{\underline{m}}\Gamma^{\underline{n}} = 2\eta^{\underline{mn}}, \tag{2.28}$$

the transformation of θ takes the form

$$\delta_\kappa \theta^{\underline{\mu}}(\tau) = -p_{\underline{m}} p^{\underline{m}} \kappa'^{\underline{\mu}}. \tag{2.29}$$

This transformation vanishes on the mass shell $p^2 = 0$ (2.3). Therefore, the parameters of the form (2.27) do not eliminate any on–shell gauge degrees of freedom of the superparticle.

If in (2.27) we choose $\kappa' = p_{\underline{m}}\Gamma^{\underline{m}}\kappa''$ we will see that on the mass shell (2.3) the parameter (2.27) turns to zero. We can continue such a substitution an infinite number of times and find that at any stage there are κ–parameters for which the κ–transformations are trivial on the mass shell. The reason for this (infinite) reducibility is that the spinorial matrix $p_{\underline{m}}\Gamma^{\underline{m}}$ has the rank which on the mass shell (2.3) is half the maximum rank, i.e. half the dimension $2^{[\frac{D}{2}]}$ of the spinor. This means that among the $2^{[\frac{D}{2}]}$ components of $\kappa^{\underline{\mu}}$ only half of the components are independent and effectively contribute to the κ–symmetry transformations. This also concerns fermionic constraints on the superparticle dynamics whose appearance is the consequence of κ–symmetry. In the Dirac terminology [112] these constraints belong to the first class, and in the canonical Hamiltonian formulation they are regarded as the generators of the local κ–symmetry. The constraints in question are

$$\pi_{\underline{\mu}}(\tau)(p_{\underline{m}}\Gamma^{\underline{m}})^{\underline{\mu}}{}_{\underline{\nu}} = 0, \tag{2.30}$$

where $\pi_{\underline{\mu}} = \frac{\delta L}{\delta \dot{\theta}^{\underline{\mu}}} = i\bar{\theta}_{\underline{\nu}}(p_{\underline{m}}\Gamma^{\underline{m}})^{\underline{\nu}}{}_{\underline{\mu}}$ is the momentum canonically conjugate to the Grassmann coordinate θ. Since the expression for π does not contain time–derivatives it is a fermionic

spinorial constraint

$$D_{\underline{\mu}} = \pi_{\underline{\mu}} - i\bar{\theta}_{\underline{\nu}}(p_{\underline{m}}\Gamma^{\underline{m}})^{\underline{\nu}}{}_{\underline{\mu}} = 0. \tag{2.31}$$

Under the canonical Poisson brackets $[p_{\underline{m}}, x^{\underline{n}}] = \delta^{\underline{n}}_{\underline{m}}$, $\{\pi_{\underline{\mu}}, \theta^{\underline{\nu}}\} = \delta^{\underline{\nu}\dagger}_{\underline{\mu}}$ the constraints (2.31) have the anticommutation properties of the super–Poincare algebra

$$\{\bar{D}^{\underline{\mu}}, D_{\underline{\nu}}\} = -2i(p_{\underline{m}}\Gamma^{\underline{m}})^{\underline{\mu}}{}_{\underline{\nu}}. \tag{2.32}$$

As we have seen, the matrix on the right hand side of (2.32) is degenerate and has the rank one half of the maximum rank. Thus half the constraints (2.32) are of the second class and another half are of the first class, the anticommutator of the latter being (weakly) zero.

Without introducing auxiliary fields it turns out to be impossible to split the fermionic spinor constraints (2.31) into irreducible Lorentz covariant sets of first and second class constraints because the spinor representation of the Lorentz group is the fundamental one and cannot be decomposed into any other Lorentz group representations.

The maximum we can do in the present situation is to get an infinite reducible covariant set of the first class fermionic constraints (2.30) multiplying (2.31) by $p_{\underline{m}}\Gamma^{\underline{m}}$, or to break manifest Lorentz covariance.

If we try to covariantly quantize the superparticle model, the infinite reducibility of κ-symmetry and of the corresponding constraints will require the introduction of an infinite set of ghosts for ghosts [113] and, in addition, we should also manage with the second class constraints contained in (2.31). All this makes the problem of the covariant quantization of superparticles and superstrings a difficult one.

To be able to split the fermionic constraints (2.31) into irreducible sets of first and second class constraints it has been proposed to enlarge the space of superparticle (and superstring) variables with auxiliary bosonic spinor variables (twistors [77, 80]–[84, 27], or Lorentz harmonics [87],[88]–[94, 53]) and to use these variables to carry out a covariant split of the constraints.

Below we shall see that these auxiliary variables naturally appear in the doubly supersymmetric formulations of the super–p–branes.

2.4 Spinning superparticles

Let us now make the next step and to construct particle models which would be invariant under both the worldline (2.10) and the target–space (2.19) supersymmetry transformations. The worldline of such a particle is a supersurface $z^M = (\tau, \eta)$ embedded into the target superspace $Z^{\underline{M}} = (X^{\underline{m}}, \Theta^{\underline{\mu}})$. I.e. the particle trajectory is

$$Z^{\underline{M}}(z^M) = Z^{\underline{M}}(\tau, \eta) = (X^{\underline{m}}(\tau, \eta), \Theta^{\underline{\mu}}(\tau, \eta))\,, \tag{2.33}$$

[†]The brackets $[,]$ and $\{,\}$ stand for commutation and anticommutation relations, respectively.

where the worldvolume superfield $X^{\underline{m}}(\tau,\eta)$ is the same as in (2.5) and

$$\Theta^{\underline{\mu}}(\tau,\eta)=\theta^{\underline{\mu}}(\tau)+\eta\lambda^{\underline{\mu}}(\tau). \tag{2.34}$$

We see that the Grassmann spinor coordinate $\theta(\tau)$ of the particle acquires a commuting spinor superpartner $\lambda(\tau)$.

Under worldline superreparametrizations (2.10) $\Theta(\tau,\eta)$ transforms as a scalar superfield

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\theta^{\underline{\mu}}&=-a(\tau)\dot\theta^{\underline{\mu}}-\frac{1}{2}\alpha(\tau)\lambda^{\underline{\mu}},\\ \delta\lambda^{\underline{\mu}}&=-a(\tau)\dot\lambda^{\underline{\mu}}-\frac{1}{2}\dot a(\tau)\lambda^{\underline{\mu}}-\frac{i}{2}\alpha(\tau)\dot\theta^{\underline{\mu}}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.35}$$

The pullback onto the superworldline of the superinvariant forms $\mathcal{E}^{\underline{A}}=(\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}},\mathcal{E}^{\underline{\alpha}})$ (2.20) takes the form

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}^{\underline{\alpha}}(Z(z^M))&=dz^M\mathcal{E}_M^{\underline{\alpha}}(Z(z))=dz^M\partial_M\Theta^{\underline{\alpha}}(z)=e_0^\tau\partial_\tau\Theta^{\underline{\alpha}}+e_0^\eta D\Theta^{\underline{\alpha}},\\ \mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}(Z(z))&=dz^M\mathcal{E}_M^{\underline{a}}(Z(z))\\ &=e_0^\tau\left(\partial_\tau X^{\underline{a}}-i\partial_\tau\bar\Theta\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\Theta\right)+e_0^\eta\left(DX^{\underline{a}}-iD\bar\Theta\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\Theta\right),\end{aligned} \tag{2.36}$$

where we have expanded the target superforms in the flat supervielbein basis (2.15) of the superworldline.

Note that the worldline spinor components of the superforms (2.36) are basic ones in the sense that the 'τ'–components can be constructed from the former by applying to the 'η'–components the covariant derivative D. We thus have

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_\tau\Theta&=-iD\left(D\Theta\right),\\ \mathcal{E}_\tau^{\underline{a}}&=\partial_\tau X^{\underline{a}}-i\partial_\tau\bar\Theta\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\Theta\\ &=-iD\left(DX^{\underline{a}}-iD\bar\Theta\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\Theta\right)-D\bar\Theta\Gamma^{\underline{a}}D\Theta.\end{aligned} \tag{2.37}$$

Therefore, it is sufficient to use the basic 'η'–components to construct doubly supersymmetric actions.

It turns out that depending on which action (2.8), (2.23) or (2.24) is generalized to acquire the second supersymmetry we get different doubly supersymmetric particle models.

The second supersymmetrization of the actions (2.8) and (2.23) results in a same doubly–supersymmetric action which describes the dynamics of so called spinning superparticles [67, 114].

To get this action we should, for example, simply replace $DX^{\underline{m}}$ in (2.10) with the basic 'η'–component of the target–space vector supervielbein pullback (2.36)

$$\mathcal{E}_\eta^{\underline{a}}=DX^{\underline{a}}-iD\bar\Theta\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\Theta. \tag{2.38}$$

The resulting action is [67, 114]

$$S=-\int d\tau d\eta\frac{1}{2E}\mathcal{E}_\eta^{\underline{a}}D\mathcal{E}_{\eta\underline{a}}. \tag{2.39}$$

We shall not discuss the properties of the particle model described by the action (2.39). The reader may find the details in references [67, 114, 31]. We only mention that the first–quantized spectrum of this particle is the direct product of the spectra of the corresponding spinning particle (2.8) and superparticle (2.23). And this is the reason for the name 'spinning superparticle'.

For instance, in D=4 the first–quantized states of the spinning particle (2.8) have spin $\frac{1}{2}$. The quantization of the $N = 1, D = 4$ massless superparticle results in states described by a chiral supermultiplet $(0, \frac{1}{2})$ which contains one complex scalar and one Weyl spinor. The direct product of these spectra fits into an $N = 1$, $D = 4$ chiral scalar $(0, \frac{1}{2})$ and vector $(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ supermultiplet. Therefore, the first–quantized states of the $D = 4$ spinning superparticle have two spins 0, two spins $\frac{1}{2}$ and spin 1. This spin content is the same as one described by an $N = 2, D = 4$ vector supermultiplet. The latter arises as a result of the quantization of an $N = 2, D = 4$ superparticle [115]. The equivalence of the two models was demonstrated in [114, 31].

We now turn to the construction of a doubly supersymmetric action which would describe a particle model with the same physical content as the standard superparticle model based on the actions (2.23) and (2.24), the role of the local worldline supersymmetry being to substitute the κ–symmetry.

2.5 Worldline superfield actions for standard superparticles. The superembedding condition.

We have seen that the number n of the independent κ–symmetry transformations is half the number of components of the Grassmann spinor coordinates of the superparticle. Therefore, if a superparticle propagates in superspace with D bosonic and $2^{[\frac{D}{2}]}$ fermionic directions, one should construct an $n = 2^{[\frac{D}{2}]-1}$ worldline supersymmetric action for being able to completely replace n κ–symmetries with n–extended worldline supersymmetry. We shall see that such actions can be constructed for $N = 1$, $D = 3, 4, 6$ and 10 massless superparticles. A particular property of these critical bosonic dimensions is that there exists a twistor–like (Cartan–Penrose) representation of a light–like vector in terms of a commuting spinor. Note that standard classical Green–Schwarz superstrings also exist only in these dimensions [58, 1], which is implicitly related to the same fact. Superparticles (including massive ones as [34, 35]) and superstring models in other space–time dimensions can be obtained from these basic models by a dimensional reduction [38, 69].

Let us first consider the simplest case of an

2.5.1 $N = 1, D = 3$ superparticle and twistors

In this case the Majorana spinor has two components and κ–symmetry has only one independent parameter. Our goal is to identify the independent κ–symmetry transformations

of (2.26) with the local worldline supersymmetry transformations (2.10). To this end we write down a worldline supersymmetric version of the first–order action (2.24)

$$S = \int d\tau d\eta \left[P_{\underline{a}} \mathcal{E}_{\eta}^{\underline{a}} - \frac{\mathcal{L}}{2} P_{\underline{a}} P^{\underline{a}} \right], \tag{2.40}$$

where the worldline even superfield $P_{\underline{a}}$ and the odd superfield $\mathcal{E}_{\eta}^{\underline{a}}$ are defined in eqs. (2.7) and (2.38), respectively, and the Lagrange multiplier superfield $\mathcal{L}(\tau, \eta)$ is Grassmann odd for the second term of (2.40) to have the right Grassmann parity.

By construction the action (2.40) is invariant under the worldline superreparametrizations (2.10) and target–space supersymmetry transformations (2.19), and it is also invariant under fermionic transformations (2.26), where all variables are replaced by corresponding superfields, and $\frac{d}{d\tau}$ is replaced by the supercovariant derivative D. At the first glance it seems that we have not got rid of the κ–symmetry since it appeared again at the worldline superfield level. However, as we shall see, the second term of (2.40) is unnecessary [38]. Its role would be to produce a superfield generalization of the mass shell condition (2.3), but, it turns out that eq. (2.3) follows already from the first term of the action (2.40). We therefore skip the second term. Then the resulting action [27]

$$S = -i \int d\tau d\eta P_{\underline{a}} \mathcal{E}_{\eta}^{\underline{a}} = -i \int d\tau d\eta P_{\underline{a}} \left[DX^{\underline{a}} - iD\bar{\Theta}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\Theta \right] \tag{2.41}$$

does not have any redundant κ–symmetry, and, as we shall now demonstrate, is equivalent to the standard superparticle action (2.24) in $D = 3$.

As we shall see in Subsection 2.5.4. in $N = 1$, $D = 4, 6$ and 10 target superspaces the $n = 1$ worldsheet superfield action (2.41) also describes standard superparticles, since then in addition to $n = 1$ worldsheet supersymmetry it has $D - 3$ hidden local fermionic κ–symmetries.

Note that the action (2.41) is of a 'topological' Chern–Simons nature [32] since it is invariant under the local worldline superreparametrizations but does not contain the superworldline metric.

Performing η–integration in (2.41) we get the following action for the components of the superfields (2.5), (2.7) and (2.34)

$$S = \int d\tau p_{\underline{a}} (\dot{x}^{\underline{a}} - i\dot{\bar{\theta}}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\theta - \bar{\lambda}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\lambda) + i \int d\tau \rho_{\underline{a}} (\chi^{\underline{a}} - \bar{\lambda}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\theta). \tag{2.42}$$

The second term in (2.42) reads that $\rho_{\underline{a}}$ and $\chi^{\underline{a}}$ are auxiliary fields satisfying algebraic equations

$$\rho_{\underline{a}} = 0, \quad \chi^{\underline{a}} = \bar{\lambda}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\theta. \tag{2.43}$$

The equations of motion of $x^{\underline{a}}$ and $\theta^{\underline{\alpha}}$ are, respectively,

$$\partial_\tau p_{\underline{a}} = 0, \quad (p_{\underline{a}}\Gamma^{\underline{a}})^{\underline{\alpha}}{}_{\underline{\beta}} \partial_\tau \theta^{\underline{\beta}} = 0. \tag{2.44}$$

They are the same as eqs. (2.25) yielded by the action (2.24). We should now show that the mass shell condition (2.3) also follows from the action (2.42). This can be derived in two ways.

The variation of (2.42) with respect to $p_{\underline{a}}$ gives

$$\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{\tau}|_{\eta=0} \equiv \dot{x}^{\underline{a}} - i\dot{\bar{\theta}}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\theta = \bar{\lambda}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\lambda, \tag{2.45}$$

from which it follows that

$$\eta_{\underline{ab}}\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{\tau}\mathcal{E}^{\underline{b}}_{\tau}|_{\eta=0} = 0. \tag{2.46}$$

This is because the square of the r.h.s. of (2.45) is identically zero

$$(\bar{\lambda}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\lambda)(\bar{\lambda}\Gamma_{\underline{a}}\lambda) \equiv 0 \tag{2.47}$$

due to a property of the Γ–matrices in $D = 3$

$$(\Gamma^{\underline{m}})^{\underline{\alpha}}{}_{\underline{\beta}}(C\Gamma_{\underline{m}})_{\underline{\gamma\delta}} + (\Gamma^{\underline{m}})^{\underline{\alpha}}{}_{\underline{\gamma}}(C\Gamma_{\underline{m}})_{\underline{\delta\beta}} + (\Gamma^{\underline{m}})^{\underline{\alpha}}{}_{\underline{\delta}}(C\Gamma_{\underline{m}})_{\underline{\delta\beta}} = 0, \tag{2.48}$$

where $C_{\underline{\alpha\beta}} = \epsilon_{\underline{\alpha\beta}}$ is the charge conjugation matrix which can be used to raise and lower the spinor indices.

The identities (2.47) and (2.48) can be easily checked in the Majorana representation of the Dirac matrices where the Majorana spinor is real, and

$$C = \Gamma_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \Gamma_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \Gamma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.49}$$

The identity (2.48) also holds in $D = 4, 6$ and 10 space–time dimensions, and the eq. (2.47) is valid in these dimensions for the Majorana (or Weyl), simplectic $SU(2)$ Majorana–Weyl [117, 120] and the Majorana–Weyl spinors, respectively. As a consequence of these identities any light–like vector in these dimensions can be represented as the bilinear combination of commuting spinors (2.45). Such a representation is called the Cartan–Penrose (or twistor) representation of the light–like vector. Note that its existence in the special dimensions $D = 3, 4, 6$ and 10 is related to the existence of four division algebras associated with real, complex, quaternionic and octonionic numbers, respectively, (see [116], and [117, 118, 119] as nice reviews for physicists) which form an algebraic basis for corresponding twistor constructions [76, 81]. In application to the superembedding formulation of superparticles and superstrings these structures were exploited, for example, in references [80, 81, 27, 29, 82, 83, 121].

Let us now derive the Cartan–Penrose relation as a solution of the equation of motion of λ

$$(p_{\underline{a}}\Gamma^{\underline{a}})^{\underline{\alpha}}{}_{\underline{\beta}}\lambda^{\underline{\beta}} = 0. \tag{2.50}$$

If the matrix $p_{\underline{a}}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}$ is nondegenerate the equations (2.44) and (2.50) are satisfied only when

$$\partial_\tau\theta = 0, \qquad \lambda = 0, \tag{2.51}$$

which (in virtue of (2.45)) leads to

$$\partial_\tau x^{\underline{m}} = 0.$$

Such a solution describes a particle which is frozen in a single point of super space–time (it even does not evolve along the time direction x^0). Since this solution is physically trivial it can be discarded by requiring that the components of λ do not turn to zero simultaneously [†]. This requirement is in agreement with the definition of twistor variables [76] which are commuting spinor variables parametrizing a projective space. Then the eq. (2.50) has nontrivial solutions if the matrix $p_{\underline{a}}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}$ is degenerate, the general solution of (2.50) being

$$p_{\underline{a}} = \frac{1}{e(\tau)}\bar{\lambda}\Gamma_{\underline{a}}\lambda, \quad \Rightarrow \quad p_{\underline{a}}p^{\underline{a}} = 0, \tag{2.52}$$

or, because of the Γ–matrix identity (2.48),

$$p_{\underline{a}}(C\Gamma^{\underline{a}})_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}} = \frac{2}{e(\tau)}\lambda_{\underline{\alpha}}\lambda_{\underline{\beta}}. \tag{2.53}$$

Thus we have again arrived at the Cartan–Penrose representation of the light–like vector.

Comparing (2.52) with (2.45) we see that

$$p^{\underline{a}} = \frac{1}{e(\tau)}\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{\tau}|_{\eta=0} = \frac{1}{e(\tau)}(\dot{x}^{\underline{a}} - i\dot{\bar{\theta}}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\theta) \tag{2.54}$$

has the meaning of the superparticle canonical momentum as in the standard formulation of Subsection 2.3, and the multiplier $e(\tau)$ can be identified with the worldline gravitation field.

One can notice that the Cartan–Penrose relation (2.52) establishes a one–to–one correspondence between the two–component commuting spinor $\lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}$ and the $D = 3$ light–like vector $p^{\underline{a}}$ which also has two independent components. [The graviton $e(\tau)$ is completely auxiliary and can be gauge fixed to a constant by the worldline reparametrizations (2.2).]

Therefore, either $p^{\underline{a}}$ or $\lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}$ can be considered as independent dynamical variables in the phase space, and the number of physical degrees of freedom of the doubly supersymmetric particle is the same as that of the standard superparticle. If we choose $p^{\underline{a}}$ as an independent variable then the independent equations of motion (2.44), (2.52) and (2.54) of the dynamical variables $p^{\underline{a}}$, $x^{\underline{a}}$ and $\theta^{\underline{\alpha}}$ derived from the action (2.42) coincide with the massless superparticle equations (2.25) and (2.3) yielded by the action (2.24). The local worldline supersymmetry can be used to eliminate one (pure gauge) degree of freedom of $\theta^{\underline{\alpha}}$. All this testifies to the classical equivalence of the two actions.

The only thing which remains to establish is the relationship of the worldline supersymmetry and κ–symmetry. For this consider the worldline supersymmetry transformations

[†]Note that in the standard formulation of relativistic particles this requirement is analogous to excluding the point $e(\tau) = 0$ from the solutions of the particle equations of motion (2.25).

(2.11), (2.12) and (2.35) of $\theta^{\underline{\mu}}$, $\lambda^{\underline{\mu}}$, $x^{\underline{a}}$ and $p^{\underline{a}}$, when the relations (2.43) for the auxiliary fields $\rho_{\underline{a}}$ and $\chi^{\underline{a}}$ hold,

$$\delta\theta^{\underline{\mu}} = -\frac{1}{2}\lambda^{\underline{\mu}}\alpha(\tau), \qquad \delta\lambda^{\underline{\mu}} = \frac{i}{2}\dot{\theta}^{\underline{\mu}}\alpha(\tau), \tag{2.55}$$

$$\delta x^{\underline{a}} = \frac{i}{2}\bar{\theta}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\lambda\alpha(\tau) = -i\bar{\theta}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\delta\theta, \tag{2.56}$$

$$\delta p^{\underline{a}} = 0. \tag{2.57}$$

Without losing generality we can always replace the supersymmetry parameter $\alpha(\tau)$ with the following expression

$$\alpha(\tau) = -\frac{4i}{e}\bar{\lambda}_{\underline{\alpha}}\kappa^{\underline{\alpha}}, \tag{2.58}$$

where $\kappa_{\underline{\alpha}}(\tau)$ is an arbitrary Grassmann spinor.

If we now substitute eq. (2.58) into (2.55) and (2.56) and take into account (2.53) we shall see that the supersymmetry transformations become the κ–symmetry transformations (2.26) for $x^{\underline{a}}$ and $\theta^{\underline{\mu}}$.

It remains to derive the κ–variation of the worldvolume field $e(\tau)$ (2.26).

To this end we make use of the relation (2.52), where $e(\tau)$ appears in the formulation under consideration, and observe that when $\rho^{\underline{a}} = 0$, the particle momentum is invariant (2.57) under the local supersymmetry transformations (2.12). For consistency we must require that the r.h.s. of the Cartan–Penrose representation (2.52) of $p^{\underline{a}}$ is also invariant under the supersymmetry transformations. To show this we should find the supersymmetry variation of $e(\tau)$ which cancels the variation of λ (2.55). At this point we should also take into account that θ satisfies the equation of motion (2.44). This requirement is justified by the fact that the worldline supersymmetry transformations relate the bosonic kinematic equation (2.50), and its solution (2.52), (2.53), to the fermionic dynamical equation (2.44). In view of (2.50) and (2.53) the general solution of (2.44) is

$$\dot{\theta}^{\underline{\mu}} = \lambda^{\underline{\mu}}\tilde{\psi}(\tau), \tag{2.59}$$

where $\tilde{\psi}(\tau)$ is a Grassmann–odd worldline function.

Then the required worldline supersymmetry variation of $e(\tau)$ is

$$\delta e(\tau) = -ie(\tau)\alpha(\tau)\tilde{\psi}(\tau). \tag{2.60}$$

Substituting (2.58) in (2.60) we get the κ–symmetry variation (2.26) of $e(\tau)$.

Therefore, fermionic κ–symmetry is nothing but the worldline supersymmetry transformations of the superparticle dynamical variables when the auxiliary field components of the corresponding worldline superfields are eliminated. The independent κ–parameter (or the supersymmetry parameter) is the (Lorentz–invariant) projection of the spinorial κ–symmetry parameter onto the commuting spinor λ (2.58).

The (irreducible) first class fermionic constraint which generates $n = 1$ worldline supersymmetry (and/or irreducible κ–symmetry) is

$$\lambda^{\underline{\alpha}} D_{\underline{\alpha}} = 0, \qquad \{\lambda D, \lambda D\} = -2ip_{\underline{m}} \bar{\lambda} \Gamma^{\underline{m}} \lambda = 0, \tag{2.61}$$

where $D_{\underline{\alpha}}$ was defined in (2.31).

This completes the proof of the classical equivalence of the doubly supersymmetric model based on the action (2.41) and the standard superparticle (2.23), (2.24) in $N = 1$, $D = 3$ superspace.

Before going further it is worth mentioning the relation of the doubly supersymmetric action (2.41) and (2.42) with twistor formulations of (super)particles [77, 80]–[31, 84, 86].

We have already observed similarity between the commuting spinor variables $\lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}$ and twistors which manifests itself through the Cartan–Penrose relation between $\lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}$ and $p_{\underline{m}}$ (2.52).

If we consider $\lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}$ and not $p_{\underline{m}}$ as independent dynamical variables we can replace $p_{\underline{m}}$ in (2.42) with $\lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}$. Then hiding $e(\tau)$ by redefining $\lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}$ ($e^{-\frac{1}{2}} \lambda^{\underline{\alpha}} \rightarrow \lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}$) and dropping out the term with the fermionic auxiliary fields we get

$$S = \int d\tau \bar{\lambda} \Gamma_{\underline{a}} \lambda \left(\dot{x}^{\underline{a}} - i \dot{\bar{\theta}} \Gamma^{\underline{a}} \theta \right). \tag{2.62}$$

This action is one on which the supertwistor formulation [77, 80, 81, 82] of superparticles in space–times of dimension $D = 3, 4, 6$ and 10 is based. Various versions of the supertwistor formulation have been developed in a number of papers [80]–[86, 30, 100]. The doubly supersymmetric formulation provides us with a natural link between the standard (2.23) and the twistor description of superparticles.

2.5.2 On–shell relationship between superparticles and spinning particles

We have seen that in the doubly supersymmetric formulation of superparticles the Grassmann superpartners $\chi^{\underline{m}}$ of the particle coordinates $x^{\underline{m}}$ are treated as auxiliary variables expressed in terms of $\theta^{\underline{\alpha}}$ and $\lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}$ (eq. (2.43)). Note that the equation (2.43) can be regarded [46] as an odd counterpart of the Cartan–Penrose twistor relation (2.45), in fact, they are worldline supersymmetry partners.

On the contrary, in the theory of spinning particles (Section 2.2) $\chi^{\underline{m}}$ is a dynamical (spin) variable obeying the equations

$$\chi^{\underline{m}} p_{\underline{m}} = \chi^{\underline{m}} (\dot{x}_{\underline{m}} - \frac{i}{e} \psi \chi_{\underline{m}}) = 0, \tag{2.63}$$

$$\dot{\chi}^{\underline{m}} = \frac{1}{e} \psi \dot{x}^{\underline{m}} + \frac{\dot{e}}{2e} \chi^{\underline{m}}, \tag{2.64}$$

which are yielded by the spinning particle action (2.16).

We shall now demonstrate that the equations (2.63) and (2.64) are equivalent to the superparticle equations (2.44).

Remember that the solution of the fermionic equation in (2.44) is eq. (2.59). Substituting (2.59) into the expression for the superparticle momentum (2.54) and taking into account (2.43), i.e. that $\chi^{\underline{a}} = \bar{\lambda}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\theta$, we have

$$p^{\underline{a}} = \frac{1}{e(\tau)}(\dot{x}^{\underline{a}} - i\dot{\bar{\theta}}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\theta) = \frac{1}{e(\tau)}(\dot{x}^{\underline{a}} - i\tilde{\psi}\chi^{\underline{a}}). \tag{2.65}$$

We see that in this form the superparticle momentum coincides with the spinning particle momentum (2.18) if we take $\tilde{\psi} = \frac{1}{e}\psi$, both momenta satisfying the same equation of motion $\dot{p}^{\underline{a}} = 0$.

Contracting (2.65) with $\chi^{\underline{a}} = \bar{\lambda}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\theta$ and taking into account the Cartan–Penrose relation (2.52) for $p_{\underline{a}}$ we find that the equation (2.63) is identically satisfied.

We now check that the solution $\chi^{\underline{m}} = \bar{\theta}\Gamma^{\underline{m}}\lambda$ is compatible with the equation of motion (2.64). For this take the time derivative of $\chi^{\underline{m}}$. Then, in view of (2.59), (2.52), (2.65) and that we put $\tilde{\psi} = \frac{1}{e}\psi$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\chi}^{\underline{m}} &= \frac{1}{e}\psi\bar{\lambda}\Gamma^{\underline{m}}\lambda + \bar{\theta}\Gamma^{\underline{m}}\dot{\lambda} \\ &= \frac{1}{e}\psi(\dot{x}^{\underline{m}} - \frac{i}{e}\psi\chi^{\underline{m}}) + \bar{\theta}\Gamma^{\underline{m}}\dot{\lambda}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.66}$$

$\dot{\lambda}$ is found to be

$$\dot{\lambda} = \frac{\dot{e}}{2e}\lambda \tag{2.67}$$

by solving

$$\dot{p}^{\underline{m}} = \partial_\tau\left(\frac{1}{e}\bar{\lambda}\Gamma^{\underline{m}}\lambda\right) = 0.$$

Hence, the last term in (2.66) is equal to $\frac{\dot{e}}{2e}\chi^{\underline{m}}$, and eq. (2.66) coincides with eq. (2.64).

We have shown that the dynamical variables of the $N = 1$, $D = 3$ superparticle and the $n = 1$ spinning particle, and their equations of motion are related to each other by the Cartan–Penrose (twistor–transform) expressions (2.43) and (2.45)

$$p^{\underline{m}} = \frac{1}{e}\bar{\lambda}\Gamma^{\underline{m}}\lambda, \quad \chi^{\underline{m}} = \bar{\theta}\Gamma^{\underline{m}}\lambda.$$

Therefore, the doubly supersymmetric action (2.41) can be regarded as a 'master' action for both types of the particles. It provides us with superparticle or spinning particle equations of motion depending on whether the Grassmann vector $\chi^{\underline{m}}$ or the spinor $\theta^{\underline{\mu}}$ is chosen as an independent dynamical variable. The two particles are thus classically equivalent, though quantum mechanically (as is well known) these are systems with different spectra of states.

The on–shell relationship between $N = 1$ superparticles and $n = 1$ spinning particles [46, 47], and between $N = 1$ superstrings and $n = 1$ spinning strings [48, 49] holds also in space–time dimensions $D = 4, 6$ and 10. To demonstrate this relationship one should gauge fix all but one local worldsheet supersymmetries (or κ–symmetries) of the target space supersymmetric objects. The remaining local worldsheet supersymmetry is then

identified with $n = 1$ worldsheet supersymmetry of the corresponding spinning objects. The commuting twistor–like spinors relate the dynamical variables of the two types of models.

It is well known that the equivalence between $D = 10$ superstrings and $D = 10$ spinning strings extends to the quantum level so that the two models describe one and the same quantum string theory, provided the NSR spinning strings have been GSO-projected. The 'twistor' transform demonstrated above allows one to utilize useful properties of both the Green–Schwarz and the NSR formulation to study the problem of covariant quantization of superstring theory [54, 33, 48, 140, 55].

Another example of quantum equivalent systems (which we have mentioned in Subsection 2.4) is the equivalence between the free $N = 1$, $n = 1$ spinning superparticle and the $N = 2$ superparticle in $D = 4$ [114].

2.5.3 The superembedding condition

We now return to the consideration of the action (2.41) and repeat its analysis directly at the worldline superfield level with the purpose of getting the principal condition of the superembedding of the particle superworldline into target superspace and to analyze its properties.

The superembedding condition is derived by varying the action (2.41) with respect to the superfield $P_{\underline{a}}(\tau, \eta)$, and it reads that the superparticle moves in target superspace in such a way that the pullback of the target–space supervielbein vector component along the Grassmann direction of the superworldline is zero

$$\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{\eta} = DX^{\underline{a}} - iD\bar{\Theta}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\Theta = 0. \tag{2.68}$$

The consequence of eq. (2.68) is obtained by hitting (2.68) with the derivative D

$$\partial_\tau X^{\underline{a}} - i\partial_\tau \bar{\Theta}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\Theta - D\bar{\Theta}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}D\Theta = 0. \tag{2.69}$$

Eq. (2.69) implies that the component of $\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}$ along the time direction of the worldline is expressed in terms of the spinor components $\mathcal{E}^{\underline{\alpha}} = d\Theta^{\underline{\alpha}}$ of the target space supervielbein (2.36) along the Grassmann direction of the worldline

$$\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{\tau}(\tau, \eta) \equiv \partial_\tau X^{\underline{a}} - i\partial_\tau \bar{\Theta}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\Theta = D\bar{\Theta}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}D\Theta. \tag{2.70}$$

This is the superfield version of the Cartan–Penrose relation (2.45) which states that $\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{\tau}(\tau, \eta)$ is light–like and, hence, the superparticle is massless.

The condition (2.70) is the only consequence of eq. (2.68) which one has in the case under consideration. We see that the superembedding condition (2.68) itself does not lead to the dynamical equations of motion of the superparticle (2.44). The superfield form of

the dynamical equations is obtained from the action (2.41) by varying it with respect to $X^{\underline{a}}$ and $\Theta^{\underline{\alpha}}$

$$DP_{\underline{a}} = 0, \qquad P_{\underline{a}}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}D\Theta = 0. \tag{2.71}$$

Therefore, in the case of the $N = 1$, $D = 3$ superparticle the superembedding condition (2.44) 'prescribes' the superparticle to be massless but does not completely define its classical dynamics. The classical equations of motion of the superparticle should be derived separately, for example, from the action principle as above.

It turns out that the same situation holds for superparticles in $N = 1$, $D = 4, 6$ and 10 target superspaces.

2.5.4 $N = 1$, $D = 4, 6, 10$ superparticles

The κ–symmetry of the $N = 1$, $D = 4, 6, 10$ superparticles has $n = D - 2 = 2, 4, 8$ independent parameters, respectively. Hence, to replace κ–symmetry with local worldline supersymmetry one should consider the embedding into $N = 1$, $D = 4, 6, 10$ target superspace of a superworldline $\mathcal{M}_{1,n}$ parametrized by the bosonic time variable τ and $n = D - 2$ fermionic variables η^q $(q = 1, ..., D - 2)$.

Note that, in general, one can consider doubly supersymmetric models in $D = 4, 6$ and 10 with the number n of worldvolume supersymmetries being less than $D-2$. Such models also describe standard superbranes but with only part of the κ–symmetries represented as manifest n–extended worldline supersymmetry, the other $D-2-n$ κ–symmetries remaining hidden. In the case of superparticles and superstrings $N = 1$ doubly supersymmetric formulations with $n < D - 2$ are used for establishing the classical relationship between spinning and super objects [46]–[49] as well as for superstring quantization [54, 140].

For instance, the $n = 1$ worldline superfield action (2.41) is also a consistent action for standard $N = 1$, $D = 4, 6, 10$ superparticles, since it does possess additional fermionic symmetries which complement the $n = 1$ worldline supersymmetry to $n = D - 2$ κ–symmetries.

In the $D = 4$ case the additional κ–symmetry transformations are

$$\delta_\kappa \Theta^{\underline{\mu}} = K(\tau, \eta)(\Gamma^5 D\Theta)^{\underline{\mu}}, \quad \Gamma^5 = i\Gamma^0\Gamma^1\Gamma^2\Gamma^3, \tag{2.72}$$

$$\delta_\kappa X^{\underline{m}} = -i\bar{\Theta}\Gamma^{\underline{m}}\delta\Theta, \quad \delta P_{\underline{a}} = 0,$$

where $K(\tau, \eta) = \kappa(\tau) + \eta b(\tau)$ is an $n = 1$ superfield parameter independent of the $n = 1$ supersymmetry parameter $\Lambda(\tau, \eta)$ (2.10).

The bosonic component $b(\tau)$ of $K(\tau, \eta)$ allows one to gauge away one of the four real components of $\lambda^{\underline{\mu}}$. The remaining three components correspond to three independent components of the $D = 4$ lightlike vector $\bar{\lambda}\Gamma^{\underline{m}}\lambda$ associated with the superparticle momentum.

The appearance in (2.72) of the matrix Γ^5 reflects (in the language of the Majorana spinors) the presence of the complex structure inherent to the Weyl representation of the $D = 4$ spinors. (The symmetry with the parameter $b(\tau)$ then becomes local $U(1)$ symmetry acting on Weyl spinors λ). This allows one to promote the second fermionic symmetry (2.72) to the second manifest worldsheet supersymmetry by constructing an $n = 2$ superfield action in $N = 1$, $D = 4$ superspace as an alternative to (2.41) (see [27, 36, 38]).

In $D = 6$ the action (2.41) should possess 4 fermionic symmetries one of which is $n = 1$ worldline supersymmetry (2.10). To show how the other three look we should introduce the notion of the $SU(2)$ simplectic Majorana–Weyl spinors (see [117, 120] for details). The spinor index $\underline{\alpha} = 1, ..., 8$ splits into the $SU(2)$ index $i = 1, 2$ and the index $\alpha = 1, ..., 4$ of a fundamental representation of $SU^*(4) \sim SO(1, 5)$. By definition the $SU(2)$ simplectic Majorana–Weyl spinor satisfies a pseudoreality condition

$$\overline{\theta^{\alpha i}} := \bar{\theta}_i^{\dot{\alpha}} = B^{\dot{\alpha}}{}_{\beta}\theta^{\beta j}\epsilon_{ji}, \tag{2.73}$$

where the matrix B is defined by the conditions

$$B\gamma^{\underline{m}}B^{-1} = (\gamma^{\underline{m}})^*, \quad B^*B = -1$$

and * denotes complex conjugation.

The 4×4 matrices $\gamma^{\underline{m}}$ replace the $D = 6$ Dirac matrices and are analogs of 2×2 σ–matrices in $D = 4$. They are antisymmetric

$$\gamma^{\underline{m}}_{\alpha\beta} = -\gamma^{\underline{m}}_{\beta\alpha}. \tag{2.74}$$

Then **3** hidden local fermionic symmetries of the action (2.41) in $D = 6$ are given by

$$\delta\Theta^{\alpha i} = K_I(\tau, \eta)(\sigma^I)^i{}_j D\Theta^{\alpha j}, \tag{2.75}$$

where $(\sigma^I)^i{}_j$ $(I = 1, 2, 3)$ are the $SU(2)$ Pauli matrices. $X^{\underline{a}}$ and $P_{\underline{a}}$ are transformed as in (2.72).

The commuting spinor $\lambda_{\alpha i}$ has now **8** real components. **5** of these components correspond to five independent components of a $D = 6$ lightlike vector (the particle momentum), and another three are to be pure gauge degrees of freedom. Indeed, they are eliminated by local $SU(2)$ transformations

$$\delta\lambda^{\alpha i} = b_I(\tau)(\sigma^I)^i{}_j\lambda^{\alpha j} \tag{2.76}$$

which are part of (2.75), where $b_I(\tau) = DK_I|_{\eta=0}$.

The $n = 4$ superfield generalization of (2.41), which involves only one twistor–like spinor $\lambda^{\alpha i}$ and makes the symmetries (2.75) manifest, was constructed in [36] by the use of the harmonic superspace technique [87].

In the $D = 10$ case the situation becomes much more complicated since to furnish all **8** fermionic symmetries of the action (2.41) in an irreducible form one should deal with the nonassociative octonionic structure [29]. [A corresponding $n = 8$ octonionic superfield action which would directly produce (2.42) is unknown]. However, it is possible to write down a reducible set of κ–transformations which complement the $n = 1$ local supersymmetry (2.82) to eight independent fermionic symmetries of the action (2.41) in the $D = 10$ case [30, 48]

$$\delta_\kappa \Theta^{\underline{\alpha}} = (D\bar{\Theta}\Gamma_{\underline{a}} D\Theta)(\Gamma^{\underline{a}} K)^{\underline{\alpha}} - 2D\Theta^{\underline{\alpha}}(D\bar{\Theta}K). \tag{2.77}$$

$$\delta_\kappa X^{\underline{m}} = -i\bar{\Theta}\Gamma^{\underline{m}}\delta_\kappa\Theta.$$

The transformations (2.77) are reducible since the parameters $K^{\underline{\alpha}}(\tau, \eta)$ in the form

$$K = (\Gamma^{\underline{a}} K_a) D\Theta, \quad K_a = \tilde{K}(D\bar{\Theta}\Gamma_{\underline{a}} D\Theta)$$

do not contribute to (2.77). It can be shown that the number of independent components in $K^{\underline{\alpha}}$ is **7**.

The fermionic superparameter $K^{\underline{\alpha}}(\tau, \eta)$ contains bosonic parameters which allow one to eliminate **7** of the **16** components of $\lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}$, so that the remaining **9** components again correspond to a lightlike $D = 10$ vector.

It is worth mentioning that the appearance in (2.72)–(2.77) of extra bosonic gauge transformations which reduce the number of independent components of $\lambda^{\underline{\mu}}$ is related to the well known fact that in $D = 3, 4, 6$ and 10 the commuting spinors ("twistors") with $n = 2(D-2) = 2, 4, 8$ and 16 components parametrize, respectively, S^1, S^3, S^7 and S^{15} spheres. (In each case one spinor component can be fixed to be a constant by scale transformations, which corresponds to worldline reparametrizations when these spinors appear in particle models). These spheres are Hopf fibrations (fiber bundles) which are associated with the division algebras **R, C, H** and **O** of the real, complex, quaternionic and octonionic numbers. The bases of these fiber bundles are, respectively, the spheres S^1, S^2, S^4 and S^8, and the fibers are the group manifolds Z^2, $S^1 = U(1)$ and $S^3 = SU(2)$, and a sphere S^7 (which is not a group manifold). The base spheres correspond to and are parametrized (up to a scaling factor) by light–like vectors (massless particle momenta) in $D = 3, 4, 6$ and 10, respectively, and the fibers correspond to pure gauge degrees of freedom associated with additional gauge symmetries of the superparticle models discussed above.

We have thus shown that the $n = 1$ superfield action (2.41) is nonmanifestly κ–symmetric in $D = 3, 4, 6$ and 10 space–time dimensions and, hence, describes $N = 1$ superparticles. The generalization of the action (2.41) to a $d = 2$ worldsheet will describe $N = 1$ $D = 3, 4, 6, 10$ tensionless superstrings.

As we have already mentioned there are different ways of constructing appropriate (classically equivalent) manifestly $n = D - 2$ worldline supersymmetric actions for $N = 1$

superparticles [27, 36] and $N = 1$ superstrings [28, 33, 34, 37] in $D = 4$ and 6 target superspaces which make use of complex and quaternionic (or harmonic) analyticity structure inherent to these superspaces. However, the simplest way (and the only known one for $N = 1$, $D = 10$ superparticles [58] and superstrings [33, 40]) is to write down a straightforward generalization of the action (2.41). For this we should define an appropriate geometry of an $n = D - 2$ worldline superspace $\mathcal{M}_{1,n}$.

As in the case of $n = 1$ worldline superspace (2.10), (2.15) the supergeometry of $\mathcal{M}_{1,n}$ can always be chosen to be superconformally flat. I.e. the worldline supervielbeins have the form

$$\begin{aligned} e^\tau &= E(\tau,\eta)e_0^\tau = E(\tau,\eta)(d\tau + i\eta^q d\eta^q), \\ e^q &= E^{\frac{1}{2}}(\tau,\eta)d\eta^q - ie_0^\tau D^q E^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad q = 1,\cdots,n \end{aligned} \tag{2.78}$$

(indices $p, q, r, s...$ from the end of the Latin alphabet will be always reserved for a representation of an internal group transformations of η^q). And one can again work with flat supervielbeins e_0^τ and $e_0^q = d\eta^q$ and flat supercovariant derivatives

$$D_q = \frac{\partial}{\partial\eta^q} + i\eta_q\partial_\tau, \qquad \{D_q, D_r\} = 2i\delta_{qr}\partial_\tau. \tag{2.79}$$

For the worldline superdiffeomorphisms $z'^M = z'^M(z^N)$ of the $\mathcal{M}_{1,n}$ coordinates $z^M = (\tau, \eta^q)$ to preserve the conformal structure on $\mathcal{M}_{1,n}$ they must be restricted to satisfy the constraint

$$D_q\tau' - i\eta'^r D_q\eta'^r = 0, \tag{2.80}$$

which implies that the odd supercovariant derivatives transform homogeneously under the restricted superdiffeomorphisms

$$D_q = D_q\eta'^r D'_r. \tag{2.81}$$

The infinitesimal form of the superreparametrizations (restricted superdiffeomorphisms) (2.80) is determined (as in eq. (2.10)) by a single unconstrained superparameter $\Lambda(\tau, \eta^q)$

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\tau &= \Lambda(\tau,\eta) - \tfrac{1}{2}\eta^q D_q\Lambda, \\ \delta\eta^q &= -\tfrac{i}{2}D^q\Lambda, \\ \delta D_q &= -\tfrac{1}{2}\dot{\Lambda}D_q + \tfrac{i}{4}[D_q, D_r]\Lambda D^r. \end{aligned} \tag{2.82}$$

In addition to the bosonic reparametrization parameter $a(\tau) = \Lambda|_{\eta=0}$ and the worldline supersymmetry parameter $\alpha_q(\tau) = -iD_q\Lambda|_{\eta=0}$ the superfunction $\Lambda(\tau, \eta)$ contains parameters of local $SO(n)$ rotations $b_{qr}(\tau) = [D_q, D_r]\Lambda|_{\eta=0}$. The fermionic coordinates η^q transform under an n–dimensional representation of $SO(n)$. The $SO(n)$ indices are raised and lowered by the unit matrix and hence there is no distinction between them.

Let us embed the superworldline $\mathcal{M}_{1,n}$ into $N = 1$, $D = 4, 6, 10$ target superspace. The image of $\mathcal{M}_{1,n}$ is described by the worldline superfields $Z^{\underline{M}}(z^M) = (X^{\underline{m}}(\tau, \eta^q), \Theta^{\underline{\mu}}(\tau, \eta^q))$ which now have many more components than in the $n = 1$ case

$$X^{\underline{m}}(\tau,\eta^q) = x^{\underline{m}}(\tau) + i\eta^q\chi_q^{\underline{m}}(\tau) + ..., \tag{2.83}$$

$$\Theta^{\underline{\mu}}(\tau,\eta^q)=\theta^{\underline{\mu}}(\tau)+\eta^q\lambda^{\underline{\mu}}_q(\tau)+...,\tag{2.84}$$

where dots denote terms of higher orders in η^q.

The pullback onto $\mathcal{M}_{1,n}$ of the target–space supervielbeins (2.20) is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}^{\underline{\alpha}}(Z(z^M)) &= dz^M\mathcal{E}^{\underline{\alpha}}_M(Z(z))=dz^M\partial_M\Theta^{\underline{\alpha}}(z)=e^\tau_0\partial_\tau\Theta^{\underline{\alpha}}+e^q_0D_q\Theta^{\underline{\alpha}},\\ \mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}(Z(z)) &= dz^M\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_M(Z(z))\\ &= e^\tau_0\left(\partial_\tau X^{\underline{a}}-i\partial_\tau\bar\Theta\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\Theta\right)+e^q_0\left(D_qX^{\underline{a}}-iD_q\bar\Theta\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\Theta\right)\end{aligned}\tag{2.85}$$

We postulate that the dynamics of massless superparticles in dimensions $D=4,6,10$ is governed by the superembedding condition similar to eq. (2.68)

$$\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_q(Z(z))=D_qX^{\underline{a}}-iD_q\bar\Theta\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\Theta=0.\tag{2.86}$$

Let us analyze the consequences of (2.86). We shall see that (2.86) contains the mass–shell condition of massless superparticle dynamics, and that only the leading components of the superfields (2.83) and (2.84) are independent, while all other components are auxiliary and expressed in terms of the leading components and their derivatives [33, 42].

Taking the covariant derivative D_r of (2.86), symmetrizing the result with respect to the indices r and q and taking into account eq. (2.79) we get

$$\delta_{qr}(\partial_\tau X^{\underline{a}}-i\partial_\tau\bar\Theta\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\Theta)=D_q\bar\Theta\Gamma^{\underline{a}}D_r\Theta,\tag{2.87}$$

where the r.h.s of (2.87) is automatically symmetric in q and r because of symmetry properties of the Γ–matrices in $D=3,4,6$ and 10.

From eq. (2.87) it follows that

$$\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_\tau(z^M)=\partial_\tau X^{\underline{a}}-i\partial_\tau\bar\Theta\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\Theta=\frac{1}{D-2}D_q\bar\Theta\Gamma^{\underline{a}}D_q\Theta,\tag{2.88}$$

and

$$D_q\bar\Theta\Gamma^{\underline{a}}D_r\Theta=\frac{1}{D-2}\delta_{qr}D_s\bar\Theta\Gamma^{\underline{a}}D_s\Theta.\tag{2.89}$$

The condition (2.88) is analogous to (2.70), and (2.89) is an additional one. It, in particular, restricts the number of independent components of the $n=D-2$ commuting spinors $\lambda^{\underline{\mu}}_q=D_q\Theta^{\underline{\mu}}|_{\eta=0}$ in the superfield (2.84) in such a way that $\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_\tau$ determined in (2.88) is lightlike. To check this one should simply convince oneself that the square of the r.h.s. of (2.88) is identically zero due to the properties (2.48) of the Γ–matrices and by virtue of the relation (2.89).

Hence, the superparticle with the superworldline embedding specified by the condition (2.86) is massless.

We shall now show that the superembedding condition (2.86) completely determines the higher components of the superfields (2.83) and (2.84) in terms of their leading components $x^{\underline{m}}$ and $\theta^{\underline{\mu}}$ up to bosonic local worldline reparametrizations and local $SO(D-2)$ rotations (2.82).

To this end one should prove that because of eq. (2.89) the number of independent components of the bosonic matrix $D_q\Theta^{\underline{\mu}}$ is equal (up to the $SO(D-2)$ rotations) to the number of the independent components of the light–like vector $\mathcal{E}_{\tau}^{\underline{a}}$ (2.88).

The vector $\mathcal{E}_{\tau}^{\underline{a}}$ has (up to τ–reparametrizations) $n = D-2$ independent components and parametrizes an S^n–sphere. Indeed, the condition $\mathcal{E}_{\tau}^{\underline{a}}\mathcal{E}_{\tau}^{\underline{b}}\eta_{\underline{ab}} = 0$ implies that

$$(\mathcal{E}_{\tau}^{\underline{D-1}})^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{i=D-2}(\mathcal{E}_{\tau}^{i})^2 = (\mathcal{E}_{\tau}^{\underline{0}})^2 \equiv (\partial_\tau X^{\underline{0}} - i\partial_\tau\bar{\Theta}\Gamma^{\underline{0}}\Theta)^2, \tag{2.90}$$

where i stands for $D-2$ transverse spatial directions and 0 denotes the time component of the vector. The r.h.s. of (2.90) can be put to 1 by gauge fixing, in an appropriate way, the worldline bosonic $a(\tau)$–reparametrizations contained in (2.82) of $X^{\underline{0}}$ (2.11). Thus the remaining $D-1$ spatial components of the light–like velocity $\mathcal{E}_{\tau}^{\underline{a}}$, among which $D-2$ are independent, parametrize an S^n–sphere.

The matrix $D_q\Theta^{\underline{\mu}}$ has $2(D-2)^2$ components, since the spinor representations which we choose in $D = 3, 4, 6$ and 10 have dimension $2(D-2)$. $\frac{1}{2}(D-2)(D-3)+1$ components of this matrix can be eliminated by the use of $SO(D-2)$ rotations and $a(\tau)$–reparametrizations (2.82), since D_q carries the $SO(D-2)$ index and $D_q\Theta^{\underline{\mu}}$ transforms homogeneously under finite worldline reparametrizations and $SO(D-2)$ rotations

$$D_q\Theta^{\underline{\mu}}(z) = D_q\eta'^r D'_r\Theta'^{\underline{\mu}}(z'). \tag{2.91}$$

One can derive eq. (2.91) from the finite extension (2.80) of the worldline superreparametrizations (2.82).

Note that $D_q\eta'^r$ satisfies the same differential conditions as $D_q\Theta^{\underline{\mu}}$, i.e.

$$\{D_s, D_q\}\eta'^r - \frac{2i}{D-2}\delta_{sq}\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau}\eta'^r = 0, \tag{2.92}$$

and algebraic constraints

$$D_q\eta'^r D_s\eta'^r + D_s\eta'^r D_q\eta'^r = \frac{1}{D-2}\delta_{qs}D_t\eta'^r D_t\eta'^r, \tag{2.93}$$

which resemble the integrability condition (2.89). The conditions (2.93) are, in fact, the integrability conditions of the constraint (2.80) for the worldline superreparametrizations to preserve the conformally flat geometrical structure of the superworldline.

This guarantees that $\frac{1}{2}(D-2)(D-3)+1$ components of $D_q\Theta^{\underline{\mu}}$ can be gauged away by appropriate $SO(D-2)$–rotations and $a(\tau)$–reparametrizations.

We thus remain with $2(D-2)^2 - \frac{1}{2}(D-2)(D-3) - 1 = \frac{1}{2}(D-2)(3D-5) - 1$ components.

From (2.89) it follows that eq. (2.88) holds for each value of the index q separately (without the factor $n = D-2$ on the r.h.s.). This means that $(D-1)(D-2)$ components of $D_q\Theta^{\underline{\mu}}$ are expressed in terms of $D-1$ components of the lightlike vector. Thus the

number of components of the matrix $D_q\Theta^{\underline{\mu}}$ still remaining undetermined is $\frac{1}{2}(D-2)(3D-5)-1-(D-1)(D-2)=\frac{1}{2}(D-1)(D-2)-1$.

We now show, following the nice reasoning of refs. [39], that these remaining components are restricted to be zero by the algebraic equations (2.89).

Let us consider a particular form of the Γ–matrices, which corresponds to a choice of light–cone coordinates in D–dimensional target space. This breaks manifest Lorentz symmetry $SO(1,D-1)$ of the target space down to its subgroup $SO(1,1)\times SO(D-2)$. (We have already made a light–cone splitting of the components of a lightlike vector when we analyzed the geometrical meaning of the masslessness condition (2.90)).

Further on, the case of space–time dimension $D=6$ should be handled separately, since there are no Majorana spinors in this dimension and we deal instead with $SU(2)$ simplectic Majorana–Weyl spinors (2.73). The choice of an appropriate realization of the $D=6$ Γ–matrices differs from that in $D=3,4$ and 10 space–time dimensions. Anyway, the $D=6$ analysis can be performed along exactly the same lines and gives the same results as the analysis of the $D=4$ and $D=10$ case below, and we leave it for the reader as an exercise.

In the dimensions $D=3,4$, and 10 in the Majorana representation the matrices $(C\Gamma^{\underline{a}})_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}}$ are symmetric and can be chosen as follows

$$C\Gamma^0=\begin{pmatrix}1&0\\0&1\end{pmatrix},\qquad C\Gamma^i=\begin{pmatrix}0&\gamma^i\\(\gamma^i)^T&0\end{pmatrix},\qquad C\Gamma^{D-1}=\begin{pmatrix}1&0\\0&-1\end{pmatrix},\qquad (2.94)$$

where $\gamma^i_{qq'}$ are spinor matrices in a $(D-2)$–dimensional space ($D=3,4,10$) associated with the space transverse to the particle trajectory. The indices $i=1,...,D-2$, $q=1,...,D-2$ and $q'=1,...,D-2$ are indices, respectively, of the vector and two (generally nonequivalent) spinor representations of the group $SO(D-2)$ of transformations acting in this space. For $SO(D-2)$ we use the same indices $q,r,...$ as for the worldline internal group $SO(n)$ ($n=D-2$), since in an appropriate gauge both groups are identified, as we shall see in a minute.

When $D=4$ the transverse space is two–dimensional. The group of transverse rotations is $SO(2)$, and it has one 2–dimensional spinor representation.

In the case of $D=10$ the 16×16 matrices (2.94) which act on the 16–component real Majorana–Weyl spinors are analogs of $D=4$ σ–matrices rather than the Dirac matrices which are 32×32 matrices in $D=10$ (see, for example, [45] for details on $D=10$ and $D=11$ Γ–matrices). The transverse space is now 8–dimensional, and $SO(8)$ has one vector and two different spinor representations, all three being related by a famous triality property, which shows up in properties of octonions [118, 119].

In the basis (2.94) the matrix $\mathcal{E}^{\underline{\mu}}_q=D_q\Theta^{\underline{\mu}}$ splits into two $(D-2)\times(D-2)$ matrices

$$\mathcal{E}^{\underline{\mu}}_q=D_q\Theta^{\underline{\mu}}=(\mathcal{E}^r_q,\mathcal{E}^{r'}_q),\qquad (2.95)$$

and the eqs. (2.89) take the form

$$\mathcal{E}_q^t \mathcal{E}_r^t = \frac{1}{D-2}\delta_{qr}\mathcal{E}_s^t \mathcal{E}_s^t \tag{2.96}$$

$$\mathcal{E}_q^s \gamma^i_{ss'}\mathcal{E}_r^{s'} + \mathcal{E}_r^s \gamma^i_{ss'}\mathcal{E}_q^{s'} = \frac{2}{D-2}\delta_{qr}\mathcal{E}_s^t \gamma^i_{tt'}\mathcal{E}_s^{t'} \tag{2.97}$$

$$\mathcal{E}_q^{t'} \mathcal{E}_r^{t'} = \frac{1}{D-2}\delta_{qr}\mathcal{E}_s^{t'} \mathcal{E}_s^{t'}. \tag{2.98}$$

To proceed with the analysis of eqs. (2.96)–(2.98) we should first require that the matrix $\mathcal{E}_q^{\underline{\mu}}$ has the maximum rank $D-2$. This requirement is of the same nature as one which we introduced in the case of the $N=1$, $D=3$ superparticle (subsection 2.5.1) when, to discard an unphysical "frozen" particle solution, we assumed that all components of the commuting spinor $\lambda^{\underline{\mu}}$ cannot be equal to zero simultaneously.

When the rectangular matrix $\mathcal{E}_q^{\underline{\mu}}$ is split as in (2.95) the requirement for it to have the maximum rank is equivalent to the requirement that the determinant of either $\mathcal{E}_q^r$ or $\mathcal{E}_q^{r'}$ is nonzero.

From (2.96) and (2.98) we see that $\mathcal{E}_q^r$ and $\mathcal{E}_q^{r'}$ satisfy (up to a normalization) the properties of the orthogonal matrices $SO(D-2)$. Hence, if, for example, $\det \mathcal{E}_q^r \neq 0$, we can use the worldline transformations (2.91) to gauge fix $\mathcal{E}_q^\alpha$ to be the unit matrix

$$\mathcal{E}_q^r = D_q \Theta^r = \delta_q^r. \tag{2.99}$$

The meaning of this gauge condition is twofold. It identifies the $SO(D-2)$ group of superworldline transformations with the subgroup $SO(D-2)$ of the target space Lorentz group $SO(1,D-1)$, and it identifies half of the target space Grassmann coordinates $\Theta^{\underline{\mu}} = (\Theta^r, \Theta^{r'})$ with the Grassmann coordinates of the superworldline

$$\Theta^r = \eta^q \delta_q^r \quad \Rightarrow \quad \Theta^r|_{\eta=0} = \theta^r(\tau) = 0. \tag{2.100}$$

Thus, half of the target space supersymmetries are identified with worldsurface supersymmetry. It is this half of the supersymmetries of the target space vacuum which remain unbroken in the presence of superbranes.

The condition (2.99), (2.100) is the superworldsheet counterpart of the light–cone condition $(\Gamma^0 + \Gamma^{D-1})\theta = 0$ often used in the standard formulation of superparticles and superstrings to gauge fix the κ–symmetry [1].

In the gauge (2.99) the condition (2.96) is identically satisfied and eq. (2.97) takes the form

$$\gamma^i_{qq'}\mathcal{E}_r^{q'} + \gamma^i_{rq'}\mathcal{E}_q^{q'} = \frac{2}{D-2}\delta_{qr}\gamma^i_{sq'}\mathcal{E}_s^{q'}. \tag{2.101}$$

It can be easily checked that the general solution of (2.101) in the dimensions $D-2 = 2$ and 8 is

$$\mathcal{E}_{qq'} = \gamma^i_{qq'} V_i(z), \tag{2.102}$$

where $V_i(z)$ is an $SO(D-2)$–vector superfield. Then eq. (2.98) is identically satisfied.

Substituting the expressions (2.99) and (2.102) for $\mathcal{E}_q^{\underline{\alpha}}$ into (2.88) we find that the vector V^i coincides with the (independent) transverse components of the light–like particle velocity $\mathcal{E}_\tau^{\underline{a}}$ (2.90)

$$\mathcal{E}_\tau^{\underline{0}} + \mathcal{E}_\tau^{\underline{D-1}} = 1, \quad \mathcal{E}_\tau^{\underline{0}} - \mathcal{E}_\tau^{\underline{D-1}} = V^i V^i, \quad \mathcal{E}_\tau^i = V^i. \tag{2.103}$$

We have thus proved that, up to the worldline superreparametrizations, the integrability conditions (2.88) and (2.89) of the superembedding condition (2.86) completely express the components of the spinor matrix $\mathcal{E}_q^{\underline{\alpha}} = D_q \Theta^{\underline{\alpha}}$ in terms of the components of $\mathcal{E}_\tau^{\underline{a}} = \partial_\tau X^{\underline{a}} - i\partial_\tau \bar{\Theta}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\Theta$. [†] Then from the form of (2.86), (2.102) and (2.103) it follows that (up to the worldline superreparametrizations) all higher components of the superfields $X^{\underline{a}}(z)$ and $\Theta^{\underline{\alpha}}(z)$ are expressed through their leading components which are dynamical variables in the superparticle model. This is a remarkable property of the superembedding condition given the large number of the components which constitute the worldline superfields when, for instance, $D = 10$ and the number of superworldline Grassmann coordinates is $n = 8$.

It implicitly follows from the solution (2.102) and (2.103) of the integrability conditions (2.88) and (2.89) that the superembedding condition does not contain the dynamical equations of motion (2.44) of the physical particle variables $x^{\underline{m}}(\tau)$ and $\theta^{\underline{\mu}}(\tau)$, i.e. $\partial_\tau x^{\underline{m}}$ and $\partial_\tau \theta^{\underline{\mu}}$ remain unrestricted. Hence again, as in the case of the $N = 1$, $D = 3$ superparticle, to completely determine the classical dynamics of the superparticle one should construct an action from which the dynamical equations of motion are derived.

The straightforward generalization of the action (2.41) which produces the superembedding condition is

$$S = -i \int d\tau d^{D-2}\eta P_{\underline{a}}^q \mathcal{E}_q^{\underline{a}} = -i \int d\tau d^{D-2}\eta P_{\underline{a}}^q \left[D_q X^{\underline{a}} - i D_q \bar{\Theta}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\Theta \right]. \tag{2.104}$$

A difference between eqs. (2.104) and (2.41) is that now $P_{\underline{a}}^q(\tau, \eta)$ is a Grassmann–odd superfield for the action (2.104) to be Grassmann–even. An appropriate variation of $P_{\underline{a}}^q$ ensures the invariance of eq. (2.104) under the worldline superreparametrizations.

The component of $P_{\underline{a}}^q$ associated with the particle momentum is

$$p^{\underline{a}} = \epsilon^{q_1 \dots q_{D-2}} D_{q_1} \dots D_{q_{D-3}} P_{q_{D-2}}^{\underline{a}} |_{\eta=0}, \tag{2.105}$$

which can be seen from a corresponding term in the component action obtained by integrating (2.104) over η. In (2.105) $\epsilon^{q_1 \dots q_{D-2}}$ is the totally antisymmetric unit tensor.

[†] We have seen that the independent components of the matrix $\mathcal{E}_q^{\underline{\alpha}}$ parametrize the sphere S^{D-2}. In Subsection 4.4 we shall demonstrate that this sphere can be realized as a compact subspace of a $2(D-2)$–dimensional coset space $\frac{SO(1,D-1)}{SO(1,1)\times SO(D-2)}$, and that the components of $\mathcal{E}_q^{\underline{\alpha}}$ are associated with Lorentz–harmonic variables in a spinor representation of $SO(1, D-1)$.

The superembedding condition is obtained by varying the action (2.104) with respect to $P^q_{\underline{a}}$. And the variations of (2.104) with respect to $X^{\underline{a}}(z)$ and $\Theta^{\underline{\alpha}}(z)$ result in the superfield equations

$$D_q P^q_{\underline{a}} = 0, \qquad P^q_{\underline{a}} \Gamma^{\underline{a}} D_q \Theta = 0, \tag{2.106}$$

which (as one can check) contain the dynamical equations (2.44) for the superparticle variables $x^{\underline{m}}(\tau)$ and $\theta^{\underline{\mu}}(\tau)$.

To complete the proof that the action (2.104) describes standard massless superparticles we should convince ourselves that the superfield $P^q_{\underline{a}}(z)$ does not contain any extra independent dynamical variables (which would otherwise mean that the model has redundant degrees of freedom).

To show this one should notice that the number of independent components of $P^q_{\underline{a}}(z)$ substantially reduces because of an additional local invariance of the action (2.104) with respect to the following transformations of $P^q_{\underline{a}}$ [39]

$$\delta P^q_{\underline{a}} = D_r(\Lambda^{qrs} \Gamma_{\underline{a}} D_s \Theta), \tag{2.107}$$

where the tensorial parameter $\Lambda^{qrs}_{\underline{\alpha}}(z)$ is totally symmetric and traceless with respect to each pair of the indices q, r, s.

Then, by analyzing the equations (2.106), it can be shown that the components of the superfield $P^q_{\underline{a}}(z)$ can either be gauged away by independent local transformations contained in (2.107) or are expressed in terms of components of $D_q \Theta^{\underline{\alpha}}$. The reader may find the details of this analysis in the references [39, 40].

In particular, we again get the superparticle equations of motion (2.44) and the Cartan–Penrose representation of the superparticle momentum (2.105)

$$\delta_{qr} p^{\underline{a}} = \frac{1}{e(\tau)} D_q \bar{\Theta} \Gamma^{\underline{a}} D_r \Theta|_{\eta=0} = \frac{1}{e(\tau)} \bar{\lambda}_q \Gamma^{\underline{a}} \lambda_r \quad \Rightarrow \tag{2.108}$$

$$\Rightarrow \quad \bar{\lambda}_q \Gamma^{\underline{a}} \lambda_r = \frac{1}{D-2} \delta_{qr} \bar{\lambda}_s \Gamma^{\underline{a}} \lambda_s.$$

coordinates

When the auxiliary fields are eliminated the worldline supersymmetry transformations of the remaining fields take the form

$$\delta\theta = -\alpha^q(\tau)\lambda_q, \quad \delta\lambda_q = -i\alpha_q \dot{\theta}, \tag{2.109}$$

$$\delta x^{\underline{a}} = -i\bar{\theta}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\delta\theta, \quad \delta p_{\underline{a}} = 0. \tag{2.110}$$

Taking $\alpha_q(\tau) = -\frac{2(D-2)i}{e} \bar{\lambda}_q \kappa(\tau)$ and using the relation (2.108) which implies

$$(p^{\underline{a}} \Gamma_{\underline{a}})^{\underline{\alpha}}{}_{\underline{\beta}} = \frac{1}{e(\tau)(D-2)} \bar{\lambda}_q \Gamma^{\underline{a}} \lambda_q (\Gamma_{\underline{a}})^{\underline{\alpha}}{}_{\underline{\beta}} = \frac{1}{e(\tau)} \lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}_q \bar{\lambda}_{q\underline{\beta}} \tag{2.111}$$

we again recover the κ–symmetry transformations (2.26).

Note that in general the expansion of the symmetric matrix $\lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}_q \lambda^{\underline{\beta}}_q$ in the basis of Γ–matrices has additional terms, for instance, in $D = 10$

$$\lambda^{\underline{\alpha}}_q \lambda^{\underline{\beta}}_q = \frac{1}{16}(\bar\lambda_q \Gamma^{\underline{a}} \lambda_q)\tilde\Gamma^{\underline{\alpha\beta}}_{\underline{a}} + \frac{1}{16\cdot 5!}(\bar\lambda_q \Gamma^{\underline{a}_1\cdots\underline{a}_5}\lambda_q)(\tilde\Gamma_{\underline{a}_1\cdots\underline{a}_5})^{\underline{\alpha\beta}}, \tag{2.112}$$

where $\tilde\Gamma^{\underline{\alpha\beta}}_{\underline{a}}$ are the same as in eq. (2.94) but have the vector index down and the spinor indices up. (Actually, $\tilde\Gamma^{\underline{\alpha\beta}}_{\underline{a}}$ are inverse of $(C\Gamma^{\underline{a}})_{\underline{\alpha\beta}}$).

In our case the terms with the antisymmetrized product of the Γ–matrices vanish

$$\bar\lambda_q \Gamma^{\underline{a}_1\cdots\underline{a}_5}\lambda_q = 0 \tag{2.113}$$

because of the condition (2.108) on the commuting spinors, which can be proved using the results of the analysis of the equations (2.89), (2.95)–(2.102). The same happens in the dimensions $D = 4$ and 6.

This completes the demonstration that the worldline superfield action (2.104) based on the superembedding condition (2.86) describes massless superparticles propagating in flat $N = 1$, $D = 3, 4, 6$ and 10 target superspaces.

2.6 Coupling to supersymmetric Maxwell fields

So far we have dealt with free superparticle models. We will now consider how the interaction of superparticles with Abelian gauge fields is described in the superembedding approach [39].

When supersymmetric gauge theory is formulated in superspace the gauge superpotential $A_{\underline{M}}(x,\theta) = (A_{\underline{m}}, A_{\underline{\mu}})$ is subject to constraints (see, for instance, [123, 124, 125, 126] and references therein). This is done to eliminate redundant fields (especially those of higher spins) in the component expansion of the superfield $A_{\underline{M}}(x,\theta)$. The constraints are imposed on the field strength of $A_{\underline{M}}(x,\theta)$ which is a target space two–form

$$F^{(2)} = \frac{1}{2} dZ^{\underline{N}} dZ^{\underline{M}} F_{\underline{MN}} = \frac{1}{2} dZ^{\underline{N}} dZ^{\underline{M}} (\partial_{\underline{M}} A_{\underline{N}} - (-)^{\underline{MN}} \partial_{\underline{N}} A_{\underline{M}}). \tag{2.114}$$

$F_{\underline{MN}}$ is Grassmann–antisymmetric, i.e. it is antisymmetric when one or both indices are bosonic (of parity 0) and symmetric when both indices are fermionic (of parity 1). (In eq. (2.114) and below the wedge product of external differentials and forms is implied. The external differential is assumed to act on the differential forms from the right, i.e. $d(PQ) = PdQ + (-1)^q dPQ$ for a p–form P and a q–form Q).

We shall also use the expansion of the forms in the supervielbein basis such as (2.20)

$$F^{(2)} = \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{E}^{\underline{B}} \mathcal{E}^{\underline{A}} F_{\underline{AB}}, \tag{2.115}$$

where

$$F_{\underline{AB}} = (-)^{\underline{M}(\underline{B}+\underline{N})} \mathcal{E}^{\underline{M}}_{\underline{A}} \mathcal{E}^{\underline{N}}_{\underline{B}} F_{\underline{MN}} \tag{2.116}$$

and $\mathcal{E}_{\underline{A}}^{\underline{M}}$ is the supervielbein matrix inverse to $\mathcal{E}^{\underline{A}} = dZ^{\underline{M}}\mathcal{E}_{\underline{M}}^{\underline{A}}$.

The constraints are imposed on components of the field strength. The essential constraint being generic to all super–Yang–Mills theories in any space–time dimension is

$$F_{\underline{\alpha\beta}} = 0. \tag{2.117}$$

Constraints on other components of $F_{\underline{AB}}$ are obtained from the consistency of the Bianchi identities $dF^{(2)} = 0$ with the constraint (2.117). We thus get that

$$F_{\underline{\alpha a}} = W_{\underline{\beta}}(\Gamma_{\underline{a}})^{\underline{\beta}}{}_{\underline{\alpha}}, \tag{2.118}$$

where $W_{\underline{\beta}}(Z)$ is a spinorial superfield.

In the case of $N = 1$, $D = 10$ super–Yang–Mills theory the consistency of the Bianchi identities in the presence of the constraint (2.117) also implies the equations of motion for the fields of the SYM supermultiplet, i.e. the constraint (2.117) puts $D = 10$ SYM on the mass shell [126, 95].

In [95] it was observed that κ–symmetry of the action of the superparticle coupled to the super–Maxwell field $A_{\underline{M}}$ requires that the Maxwell field is integrable along the lightline trajectories of the superparticle, i.e. that its field strength is zero along the superparticle trajectories. This takes place if the gauge field obeys the constraint (2.117). Thus κ–symmetry demands that the gauge field superbackground is constrained.

In the superembedding formulation light–like integrability means that the pullback of the field strength $F_{\underline{AB}}$ onto the superworldline satisfying the superembedding condition (2.86) vanishes [39].

The pullback is

$$F_{AB} = \mathcal{E}_{A}^{\underline{A}}\mathcal{E}_{B}^{\underline{B}}F_{\underline{AB}}, \tag{2.119}$$

where $\mathcal{E}_{A}^{\underline{A}} = (\mathcal{E}_{\tau}^{\underline{A}}, \mathcal{E}_{q}^{\underline{A}})$ are defined in (2.85).

Taking into account (2.86) and (2.87) we have

$$F_{qr} = \mathcal{E}_{q}^{\underline{\alpha}}\mathcal{E}_{r}^{\underline{\beta}}F_{\underline{\alpha\beta}}, \tag{2.120}$$

$$F_{\tau q} = \mathcal{E}_{\tau}^{\underline{\alpha}}\mathcal{E}_{q}^{\underline{\beta}}F_{\underline{\alpha\beta}} + \frac{1}{D-2}\bar{\mathcal{E}}_{r}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\mathcal{E}_{r}\mathcal{E}_{q}^{\underline{\beta}}F_{\underline{a\beta}}. \tag{2.121}$$

We observe that the components (2.120) and (2.121) vanish, and, hence,

$$F_{AB} = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad F_{MN} = \partial_{M}Z^{\underline{N}}\partial_{N}Z^{\underline{M}}(\partial_{\underline{M}}A_{\underline{N}} - (-)^{\underline{MN}}\partial_{\underline{N}}A_{\underline{M}}) = 0 \tag{2.122}$$

if the super–Maxwell field satisfies the constraints (2.117) and (2.118).

On the other hand, using the properties of $\mathcal{E}_{A}^{\underline{B}}$ discussed in the previous Subsection it can be shown that $F_{AB} = 0$ implies the super–Maxwell constraints.

The condition (2.122) can also be regarded as an additional superembedding condition when the gauge field superbackground in target superspaces is nontrivial.

We would like to get this condition (2.122) from a superparticle action. So we extend the free superparticle action (2.104) by an appropriate Maxwell coupling term. The extended action is

$$S = -i \int d\tau d^n \eta P^q_{\underline{a}} \mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_q + \int d\tau d^n \eta P^M (\partial_M Z^{\underline{M}} A_{\underline{M}} - \partial_M \Phi), \tag{2.123}$$

where $n = D-2$, $P^M(Z)$ is a Lagrange multiplier and $\Phi(z)$ is an auxiliary superworldline field.

The action (2.123) is invariant under Abelian gauge transformations $\delta A = d\varphi(Z)$ provided $\Phi(z)$ transforms under the pullback of $\varphi(Z)$ as a Goldstone field $\delta\Phi(z) = \varphi(Z(z))$.

The condition (2.122) arises as the integrability condition of the equation of motion

$$\frac{\delta S}{\delta P^M} = \partial_M Z^{\underline{M}} A_{\underline{M}} - \partial_M \Phi = 0. \tag{2.124}$$

The variation of the action (2.123) with respect to Φ yields the equation

$$\partial_M P^M = 0, \tag{2.125}$$

whose general solution is

$$P^M = \partial_L \tilde{\Lambda}^{LM} + \frac{1}{n!} \epsilon_{q_1 \dots q_n} \eta^{q_1} \dots \eta^{q_n} \delta^M_\tau e, \tag{2.126}$$

where e is a constant and $\tilde{\Lambda}^{LM}(z)$ is an arbitrary Grassmann antisymmetric superfield.

The field $\tilde{\Lambda}^{LM}(z)$ is a pure gauge if the action (2.123) is invariant under the following transformations of P^M

$$\delta P^M = \partial_L \Lambda^{LM}, \tag{2.127}$$

where $\Lambda^{LM}(z) = -(-)^{LM} \Lambda^{ML}(z)$.

The variation of the action (2.123) under (2.127) is

$$\delta S = -\int d\tau d^n \eta \Lambda^{AB} F_{AB} = -\int d\tau d^n \eta \Lambda^{AB} (\mathcal{E}^{\underline{\alpha}}_A \mathcal{E}^{\underline{\beta}}_B F_{\underline{\alpha\beta}} + 2\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_A \mathcal{E}^{\underline{\beta}}_B F_{\underline{a\beta}} + \mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_A \mathcal{E}^{\underline{b}}_B F_{\underline{ab}}). \tag{2.128}$$

The last term in (2.128) contains $\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_q$ and hence can be compensated by an appropriate variation of the Lagrange multiplier $P^q_{\underline{a}}$ in (2.123), while the first two terms must vanish if (2.127) is a symmetry of the action. This implies the super–Maxwell constraints (2.117) and (2.118).

Using the symmetry (2.127) one reduces the solution for P^M to the last term in (2.126). Then substituting this term back into the action (2.123) we get the standard minimal coupling Maxwell term

$$S_M = e \int d\tau \dot{Z}^{\underline{M}} A_{\underline{M}}, \tag{2.129}$$

where e plays the role of the electric charge. Thus in the superembedding formulation the electric charge arises as an integration constant of an auxiliary superworldline field[†]. Below we shall see that the string tension appears in the superembedding approach in a similar way.

[†]This is analogous to how gauge coupling constants appear in Kaluza–Klein theories upon integrating out extra compact directions.

2.7 Superembedding into curved superspaces

Consider now the propagation of superparticles in curved $N = 1$ target superspaces of bosonic dimension $D = 3, 4, 6$ and 10. Then the super Poincare transformations of $Z^{\underline{M}} = (X^{\underline{m}}, \Theta^{\underline{\mu}})$ are extended to the target–space superdiffeomorphisms

$$Z'^{\underline{M}} = Z'^{\underline{M}}(Z). \tag{2.130}$$

The flat supervielbeins $\mathcal{E}^{\underline{A}}$ (2.20) are generalized to curved supervielbeins

$$E^{\underline{A}} = dZ^{\underline{M}} E_{\underline{M}}^{\underline{A}}(Z), \tag{2.131}$$

whose leading components correspond to the target space graviton $e_{\underline{m}}^{\underline{a}}(x) = E_{\underline{m}}^{\underline{a}}|_{\theta=0}$ and the gravitino $\psi_{\underline{m}}^{\underline{\alpha}}(x) = E_{\underline{m}}^{\underline{\alpha}}|_{\theta=0}$.

Parallel transport of (spin)–tensors in curved target superspace is determined by a connection one–form $\Omega_{\underline{B}}{}^{\underline{A}} = dZ^{\underline{M}} \Omega_{\underline{M}\underline{B}}{}^{\underline{A}}$ taking values in the algebra of the tangent space group which is the Lorentz group $SO(1, D-1)$.

The geometry of curved superspace is characterized by its torsion

$$\nabla E^{\underline{A}} \equiv (dE^{\underline{A}} + E^{\underline{B}} \Omega_{\underline{B}}{}^{\underline{A}}) \equiv T^{\underline{A}} = \frac{1}{2} E^{\underline{C}} E^{\underline{B}} T_{\underline{B}\underline{C}}^{\underline{A}}, \tag{2.132}$$

and curvature

$$R_{\underline{B}}{}^{\underline{A}} = d\Omega_{\underline{B}}{}^{\underline{A}} + \Omega_{\underline{B}}{}^{\underline{C}} \Omega_{\underline{C}}{}^{\underline{A}}, \tag{2.133}$$

where $\nabla = d + \Omega$ is the covariant external differential in the curved target superspace.

The superembedding condition (2.86) is now imposed on the superworldline pullback of $E^{\underline{A}}$

$$E^{\underline{A}}(Z(z)) = e_0^{\tau}(z) \partial_\tau Z^{\underline{M}} E_{\underline{M}}^{\underline{A}} + e_0^q(z) D_q Z^{\underline{M}} E_{\underline{M}}^{\underline{A}} \equiv e_0^B E_B^{\underline{A}} \tag{2.134}$$

and takes the form

$$E_q^{\underline{a}}(Z(z)) \equiv D_q Z^{\underline{M}} E_{\underline{M}}^{\underline{a}} = 0. \tag{2.135}$$

The worldline superfield action which produces (2.135) has the same form as eq. (2.104) but with $\mathcal{E}_q^{\underline{a}}$ replaced by $E_q^{\underline{a}}$

$$S = -i \int d\tau d^{D-2} \eta P_{\underline{a}}^q E_q^{\underline{a}}. \tag{2.136}$$

This action is manifestly invariant under the target–space superdiffeomorphisms and superworldline restricted superdiffeomorphisms (2.82). For consistency it must also be invariant under local variations of $P_{\underline{a}}^q$ which generalize the transformations (2.107)

$$\delta P_{\underline{b}}^q = (\delta_{\underline{b}}^{\underline{a}} D_r + \Omega_{r\underline{b}}{}^{\underline{a}})(\Lambda^{qrs} \Gamma_{\underline{a}} E_s), \tag{2.137}$$

where E_s stands for $E_s^{\underline{\alpha}} = D_s Z^{\underline{M}} E_{\underline{M}}^{\underline{\alpha}}$, and remember that Λ^{qrs} is totally symmetric and traceless with respect to the each pair of indices q, r, s.

The variation of (2.136) under (2.137) is

$$\delta S = \frac{i}{2}\int d\tau d^{D-2}\eta(\Lambda^{qrs}\Gamma_{\underline{b}}E_s)\left(E_{\underline{q}}^{\underline{\alpha}}E_{\underline{r}}^{\underline{\beta}}T_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}}^{\underline{b}} + 2E_{\underline{q}}^{\underline{A}}E_{\underline{r}}^{\underline{a}}T_{\underline{a}\underline{A}}^{\underline{b}}\right), \tag{2.138}$$

where $T_{\underline{B}\underline{A}}^{\underline{a}}$ are components of the target superspace torsion (2.132).

The last term of (2.138) can be canceled by the following variation of $P_{\underline{a}}^{q}$

$$\delta P_{\underline{a}}^{q} = (-)^{\underline{A}}(\Lambda^{qrs}\Gamma_{\underline{b}}E_s)E_{\underline{r}}^{\underline{A}}T_{\underline{a}\underline{A}}^{\underline{b}},$$

and the first term of (2.138) must vanish, which requires the constraint on the target–space torsion

$$T_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}}^{\underline{a}} = -2i(C\Gamma^{\underline{a}})_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}}. \tag{2.139}$$

This is the basic constraint of the superfield formulation of supergravity in any dimension [123, 124, 127, 128, 129]. Note that the flat superspace torsion (2.21) is compatible with this constraint.

To conclude Subsections 2.6 and 2.7 we remark that in the superembedding formulation the constraints on gauge field and target space superbackgrounds are not a requirement of local worldsheet fermionic symmetry (as in the standard approach) but of additional local symmetries of the action under variations of the Lagrange multipliers which ensure the superembedding conditions.

In this regard it is worth mentioning that the case of the $N = 1$, $D = 3$ superparticle is a special one. The $n = 1$ worldline supersymmetry action in $D = 3$ supergravity and super–Maxwell background can be constructed in such a way that Maxwell coupling is described by the standard minimal coupling term

$$S_{N=1,D=3} = -i\int d\tau d\eta\left[P_{\underline{a}}DZ^{\underline{M}}E_{\underline{M}}^{\underline{a}} + eDZ^{\underline{M}}A_{\underline{M}}\right]. \tag{2.140}$$

In contrast to the standard κ–symmetry formulation (2.23), in the form (2.140) the $N = 1$, $D = 3$ superparticle action does not have any local symmetries which would require the target–space and gauge field background to satisfy the constraints (2.117) and (2.139). In this case the constraints should be imposed 'by hand' at the level of equations of motion.

3 Superstrings

We now turn to the consideration of superstrings in the superembedding approach, but first let us recall standard forms of the superstring action.

3.1 Green–Schwarz formulation

In this formulation (see [58, 1] for details) superstring dynamics is described by the embedding into a target superspace of a bosonic two–dimensional worldsheet parametrized

by coordinates $\xi^m = (\tau, \sigma)$. The requirement of target–space supersymmetry of the superstring action restricts the possible dimensions of the target superspace in which classical superstrings can propagate to $D = 2, 3, 4, 6$ and 10 bosonic dimensions and $2N(D-2)$ real fermionic spinor dimensions (where $N = 1, 2$ counts the number of spinors). To avoid dealing with boundary terms, in what follows we restrict ourselves to the discussion of closed superstrings.

The intrinsic geometry of the worldsheet is described by the zweibein

$$e^a(\xi) = d\xi^m e^a_m(\xi) \tag{3.1}$$

where $a = 0, 1$ are $SO(1,1)$ vector indices of the tangent space.

Below we shall also often use the light–cone basis

$$e^{++}(\xi) = e^0 + e^1, \qquad e^{--}(\xi) = e^0 - e^1, \tag{3.2}$$

where $(++, --)$ stand for $SO(1,1)$ light–cone vector components. We reserve a single $(+, -)$ for light–cone components of worldsheet spinors.

In the light–cone basis the $d = 2$ Minkowski metric takes the form

$$\eta_{++,--} = \eta_{--,++} = -\frac{1}{2}, \quad \eta_{++,++} = \eta_{--,--} = 0, \tag{3.3}$$

so that

$$e_{--} = -\frac{1}{2}e^{++}, \quad e_{++} = -\frac{1}{2}e^{--}. \tag{3.4}$$

The worldsheet metric is

$$g_{mn}(\xi) = e^a_m(\xi)e_{an}(\xi) = -\frac{1}{2}\left(e^{--}_m e^{++}_n + e^{--}_n e^{++}_m\right), \tag{3.5}$$

and

$$\det g_{mn} \equiv g = -(\det e^a_m)^2, \quad \det e^a_m = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{mn}e^{--}_m e^{++}_n \tag{3.6}$$

($\epsilon^{01} = -\epsilon^{10} = 1$, $\epsilon^{00} = \epsilon^{11} = 0$).

The pullback of the target–space supercovariant forms (2.20) onto the worldsheet is[†]

$$\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}} = d\xi^m \mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_m = d\xi^m \left(\partial_m x^{\underline{m}} - i\partial_m \bar{\theta}^I \Gamma^{\underline{m}} \theta^I\right) \delta^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{m}} = e^a \left(D_a x^{\underline{m}} - iD_a \bar{\theta}^I \Gamma^{\underline{m}} \theta^I\right) \delta^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{m}}, \tag{3.7}$$

$$\mathcal{E}^{\underline{\alpha} I} = d\xi^m \mathcal{E}^{\underline{\alpha} I}_m \;\; = \;\; d\xi^m \partial_m \theta^{\underline{\mu} I} \delta^{\underline{\alpha}}_{\underline{\mu}} = e^a D_a \theta^{\underline{\mu} I} \delta^{\underline{\alpha}}_{\underline{\mu}}, \tag{3.8}$$

where

$$D_a \equiv e^m_a(\xi)\partial_m, \tag{3.9}$$

and $e^m_a(\xi)$ is the inverse of $e^a_m(\xi)$ (i.e. $e^m_a(\xi)e^a_n(\xi) = \delta^n_m$). The index $I = 1, 2$ indicates that the number of θ–coordinates can be 1 or 2 depending on whether we deal with $N = 1$ or $N = 2$ target superspace.

[†]For simplicity we again work in flat target superspace.

The $N = 2$ Green–Schwarz superstring action is

$$S = -\frac{T}{2}\int d^2\xi\sqrt{-g}g^{mn}\mathcal{E}_m^{\underline{a}}\mathcal{E}_n^{\underline{b}}\eta_{\underline{ab}} + T\int B^{(2)}(\xi), \tag{3.10}$$

Where T is the string tension and $B^{(2)}(\xi) = \frac{1}{2}d\xi^m d\xi^n \partial_m Z^{\underline{N}}\partial_n Z^{\underline{M}} B^{(2)}_{\underline{MN}}(Z)$ is the worldsheet pullback of the target superspace two–form

$$B^{(2)} = idx^{\underline{a}}(d\bar{\theta}^1\Gamma_{\underline{a}}\theta^1 - d\bar{\theta}^2\Gamma_{\underline{a}}\theta^2) + d\bar{\theta}^1\Gamma_{\underline{a}}\theta^1 d\bar{\theta}^2\Gamma_{\underline{a}}\theta^2. \tag{3.11}$$

The physical meaning of $B^{(2)}$ is that, for instance, in $D = 10$ it describes a flat limit of the Neveu–Schwarz two–form gauge field in the superfield formulation of $D = 10$ supergravity. As we see from the action (3.10), the strings couple minimally to $B^{(2)}$, and the string tension is associated with the $B^{(2)}$–charge.

The $B^{(2)}$– term in (3.10) is called the Wess–Zumino term since it is an integral of an external differential form which does not contain the worldsheet metric and is invariant under the target space supersymmetry transformations (2.19) only up to a total derivative (and only in $D = 3, 4, 6$ and 10 where the Dirac matrices satisfy eq. (2.48)).

The definite relative coefficient between the two terms of the action (3.10) is required by κ–symmetry. The κ–symmetry transformations of the superstring dynamical variables are

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta\theta^I &= 2i\Gamma_m\kappa^{Im}(\xi), \quad \Gamma_m \equiv \mathcal{E}_m^{\underline{a}}\Gamma_{\underline{a}} \\
\delta x^{\underline{m}} &= -i\bar{\theta}^I\Gamma^{\underline{m}}\delta\theta^I \quad \Rightarrow \quad \delta Z^{\underline{M}}\mathcal{E}_{\underline{M}}^{\underline{a}} = 0, \\
\delta(\sqrt{-g}g^{mn}) &= -16\sqrt{-g}\left(P_-^{ml}\bar{\kappa}^{1n}\partial_l\theta^1 + P_+^{ml}\bar{\kappa}^{2n}\partial_l\theta^1\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

where $P_\pm^{mn}$ are projectors

$$\begin{aligned}
P_\pm^{mn} &= \frac{1}{2}(g^{mn} \pm \frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}}\epsilon^{mn}), \\
P_\pm^{mn}g_{nl}P_\pm^{lm'} &= P_\pm^{mm'}, \quad P_\pm^{mn}g_{nl}P_\mp^{lm'} = 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

and the parameters $\kappa_m^{I\underline{a}}(\xi)$ $(I = 1, 2)$ are (anti)–self–dual worldsheet vectors

$$\kappa^{1m} = P_-^{mn}\kappa_n^1, \qquad \kappa^{2m} = P_+^{mn}\kappa_n^2. \tag{3.14}$$

In the light–cone basis (3.2) the components of κ^I are

$$\kappa_{--}^1 = e_{--}^m\kappa_m^1, \quad \kappa_{++}^2 = e_{++}^m\kappa_m^2; \quad \kappa_{++}^1 = 0, \qquad \kappa_{--}^2 = 0. \tag{3.15}$$

The dynamical equations of motion of the superstring are obtained by varying (3.10) with respect to $\theta^{\underline{\mu}}(\xi)$ and $x^{\underline{m}}(\xi)$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma_m P_-^{mn}\partial_n\theta^1 &= 0, \\
\Gamma_m P_+^{mn}\partial_n\theta^2 &= 0, \\
\partial_m\left[\sqrt{-g}\left(g^{mn}\partial_n x^{\underline{m}} + 2iP_-^{mn}\partial_n\bar{\theta}^1\Gamma^{\underline{m}}\theta^1 + 2iP_+^{mn}\partial_n\bar{\theta}^2\Gamma^{\underline{m}}\theta^2\right)\right] &= 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

Varying the action (3.10) with respect to the worldsheet metric we get

$$\frac{1}{2}g_{mn}\left(g^{lp}\mathcal{E}_{\underline{l}}^{\underline{a}}\mathcal{E}_{\underline{p}}^{\underline{b}}\eta_{\underline{ab}}\right)=\mathcal{E}_{\underline{m}}^{\underline{a}}\mathcal{E}_{\underline{n}}^{\underline{b}}\eta_{\underline{ab}}\equiv G_{mn}. \tag{3.17}$$

Rewritten in the light–cone basis eqs. (3.17) take the form of the Virasoro constraints

$$\mathcal{E}_{--}^{\underline{a}}\mathcal{E}_{--\underline{a}}=0,\quad \mathcal{E}_{++}^{\underline{a}}\mathcal{E}_{++\underline{a}}=0. \tag{3.18}$$

From eqs. (3.17) it also follows that the intrinsic worldsheet metric g_{mn} can be identified with the worldsheet metric $G_{mn}=\mathcal{E}_{\underline{m}}^{\underline{a}}\mathcal{E}_{\underline{n}}^{\underline{b}}\eta_{\underline{ab}}$ induced by embedding into the target superspace

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}}g_{mn}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{-G}}G_{mn}. \tag{3.19}$$

The two metrics can be made equal by gauge fixing the invariance of the action (3.10) under the Weyl rescaling of g_{mn} ($g_{mn}\to\phi(\xi)g_{mn}$).

Using (3.19) we can eliminate the metric g_{mn} from the superstring action and rewrite it in the Nambu–Goto form

$$S=-T\int d^2\xi\sqrt{-detG_{mn}}+T\int B^{(2)}(\xi). \tag{3.20}$$

It is instructive to note that in this form of the superstring action it is more natural to replace the (anti)–self–dual worldsheet vector parameters $\kappa_{\underline{m}}^{I\underline{\alpha}}(\xi)$ of the κ–symmetry transformations (3.12) with worldsheet scalar parameters

$$\kappa^{I\underline{\alpha}}(\xi)\equiv 2i\left(\Gamma_m\kappa^{Im}\right)^{\underline{\alpha}}, \tag{3.21}$$

which satisfy the condition

$$\kappa^{I\underline{\alpha}}=\frac{1}{2}(1+\bar{\Gamma})^{I\underline{\alpha}}{}_{J\underline{\beta}}\kappa^{J\underline{\beta}}, \tag{3.22}$$

where $\frac{1}{2}(1+\bar{\Gamma})$ is the spinor projection matrix

$$\frac{1}{2}(1+\bar{\Gamma})\frac{1}{2}(1+\bar{\Gamma})=\frac{1}{2}(1+\bar{\Gamma}),$$

$$\bar{\Gamma}=\frac{1}{2\sqrt{-\det G_{mn}}}\epsilon^{m_1m_2}\Gamma_{m_1}\Gamma_{m_2}\mathcal{K},\quad (\bar{\Gamma})^2=1,\quad Tr\bar{\Gamma}=0, \tag{3.23}$$

$$\mathcal{K}^{IJ}=\begin{pmatrix}1 & 0\\ 0 & -1\end{pmatrix},$$

and, as in (3.12), $\Gamma_m=\mathcal{E}_{\underline{m}}^{\underline{a}}\Gamma_{\underline{a}}$ defines the worldsheet pullback of the target space Dirac matrices.

Eq. (3.22) implies that, again as in the case of the superparticles, the number of independent κ–transformations is half the number of components of θ and is equal to $N(D-2)$.

The property (3.22) of the parameters (3.21) can be checked using the (anti)–self–duality of κ^I_m (3.14) where in the projectors (3.13) the metric g_{mn} is replaced by G_{mn} [†].

Following our strategy we would like to replace the κ–symmetry transformations with local supersymmetry transformations. In the case of the $N = 2$ superstrings the worldsheet supersymmetry transformations should be parametrized by $n = D - 2$ worldsheet chiral and $n = D - 2$ antichiral Majorana–Weyl fermionic parameters, which can be denoted as (n, n)–supersymmetry.

In the case of the $N = 1$ superstrings (when one of the θ–coordinates in (3.10) is put to zero) the worldsheet supersymmetry should be of a heterotic type $(n, 0)$ and have $n = D - 2$ chiral or antichiral parameters. The reason why in the $N = 1$ case the worldsheet supersymmetry associated with κ–symmetry should have the heterotic (chiral) structure is that in this case there is only one κ–symmetry parameter which is either the anti–self–dual (antichiral) or self–dual (chiral) worldsheet vector (see eq. (3.13)–(3.15)).

To realize local supersymmetry on the worldsheet we should extend the latter to a supersurface $\mathcal{M}_{2;n,n}$ parametrized by two bosonic coordinates $\xi^m = (\tau, \sigma)$ and $N(D-2)$ real fermionic coordinates $\eta^{\alpha q} = (\eta^{-q}, \eta^{+q'})$ (where $\alpha = -, +$ are the spinor (chirality) indices in the light–cone basis and $q, q' = 1, ..., n$ are indices of internal $SO(D-2)$ group transformations which can be independent for η^- and η^+). Thus real $\eta^{\pm q}$ satisfy the $d = 2$ Weyl condition

$$\eta^{\pm q} = \pm\gamma^0\gamma^1\eta^{\pm q} = \pm\gamma^3\eta^{\pm q}, \tag{3.24}$$

where γ^a $(a = 0, 1)$ and γ^3 are $d = 2$ Dirac matrices which can be chosen to have the form of (2.49).

In the next subsection we consider the superembedding of a superworldsheet which describes $N = 1$ superstrings.

3.2 Doubly supersymmetric $N = 1$ superstrings

To describe the embedding of a supersurface $\mathcal{M}_{2,n}$ with d=2 bosonic coordinates $\xi^m = (\tau, \sigma)$ and $n = D - 2$ real fermionic coordinates η^{-q} into $N = 1$, $D = 3, 4, 6, 10$ target superspace we should first specify the geometrical properties of $\mathcal{M}_{2,n}$ appropriate for the description of the superstrings.

As in the case of the superparticles, we would like to make life as simple as possible and to deal with an $\mathcal{M}_{2,n}$ geometry which would be almost flat and, at the same time, preserved by *restricted* worldsheet superdiffeomorphisms containing *unrestricted* $d = 2$ local reparametrizations $\delta\xi^m = a^m(\tau, \sigma)$ and local supersymmetry transforma-

[†] Note that the κ–parameters in the form (3.21), (3.22) can also be used directly in (3.12). This would lead to a more complicated form of a redefined variation of the intrinsic metric g_{mn}. See [9] for details on this form of κ–transformations in the case of a supermembrane.

tions $\delta\eta^{-q} = \alpha^{-q}(\tau,\sigma)$. In $d = 2$ superspaces this can always be achieved starting from the most general form of the supervielbeins, imposing suitable (supergravity) constraints on the superworldsheet torsion and restricting the number of independent supervielbein components by partially gauge fixing the general worldsheet superdiffeomorphisms [122].

A suitable choice of $\mathcal{M}_{2,n}$ geometry is as follows.

The constraints on the torsion $T^A = \frac{1}{2}e^C e^B T^A_{BC} \equiv \mathcal{D}e^A(z)$ (where the covariant external differential $\mathcal{D} = \delta^A_B d + \omega_B{}^A(z)$ contains a tangent space connection) are

$$T^{--}_{-q,-r} = -i\delta_{qr}, \qquad T^{++} = 0. \tag{3.25}$$

The worldsheet supervielbeins $e^A(z)$ are

$$\begin{aligned} e^a(z^M) &= \left(d\xi^m - id\eta^{-q}e^m_{-q}(z)\right)e^a_m(z), \\ e^{-q}(z^M) &= d\eta^{-q}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.26}$$

and the supercovariant derivatives D_A (which form the tangent basis dual to (3.26)) are

$$D_{++} = e^m_{++}(z)\partial_m, \quad D_{--} = \frac{1}{n}D_{-q}e^m_{-q}(z)\partial_m, \tag{3.27}$$

$$D_{-q} = \partial_{-q} + ie^m_{-q}(z)\partial_m, \tag{3.28}$$

where $e^m_{++}(z)$ and $\frac{1}{n}D_{-q}e^m_{-q}(z)$ form the vector–vector components of the inverse supervielbein in the light–cone basis

$$\left(e^m_{--}, e^m_{++}\right) = \left(\frac{1}{n}D_{-q}e^m_{-q}, e^m_{++}\right). \tag{3.29}$$

So the supervielbein matrix is

$$e_M{}^A = \begin{pmatrix} e^a_m & 0 \\ -ie^a_m e^m_{-r}\delta^{-r}_\mu & \delta^{-q}_\mu \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.30}$$

and its inverse is

$$e_A{}^M = \begin{pmatrix} e^m_a & 0 \\ ie^m_{-q} & \delta^\mu_{-q} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3.31}$$

Note that e^m_{++} can be transformed to the component δ^m_{++} of the unit matrix by appropriate tangent space transformations $e'^m_{++} = L_{++}{}^a(z)e^m_a$. Therefore, e^m_{++}, and hence e^{++}_m, are completely auxiliary. This allows one to consider an even simpler form [40] of supervielbeins and covariant derivatives (3.26)–(3.31). However, we prefer to keep e^m_{++} arbitrary since together with e^m_{--} (at $\eta^{-q} = 0$) they are identified with the components of the worldsheet zweibein (3.1)–(3.5).

In accordance with the torsion constraints (3.25) the supercovariant derivatives (3.27), (3.28) are required to satisfy the 'flat' superalgebra

$$\{D_{-q}, D_{-r}\} = 2i\delta_{qr}D_{--}, \quad \{D_{-q}, D_{--}\} = 0. \tag{3.32}$$

This imposes the constraint on the form of the supervielbein components $e^m_{-q}(z)$

$$D_{-q}e^m_{-r} + D_{-r}e^m_{-q} = \frac{2}{n}\delta_{qr}D_{-s}e^m_{-s}. \tag{3.33}$$

The form of (3.27) and (3.28) is preserved (up to local tangent space transformations $D'_a = L_a{}^A D_A$, $D'_{-q} = L_{-q}^{-p}D_{-p}$ which include Weyl rescaling) by restricted superdiffeomorphisms whose infinitesimal form is

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\xi^m &= \Lambda^m - \frac{1}{2}e^m_{-q}D_{-q}\Lambda^{--}, \quad \delta\eta^-_q = -\frac{i}{2}D_{-q}\Lambda^{--}, & (3.34)\\ \delta D_{-q} &= \frac{i}{2}(D_{-q}D_{-r}\Lambda^{--})D_{-r}, & \\ \delta e^m_{-q} &= -iD_{-q}\Lambda^m + \frac{i}{2}(D_{-r}\Lambda^{--})D_{-q}e^m_{-r}, & (3.35) \end{aligned}$$

where $\Lambda^m(\xi,\eta)$ and $\Lambda^{--}(\xi,\eta)$ are independent worldsheet superfunction parameters. $\Lambda^{--}(\xi,\eta)$ is a self–dual vector in the same sense as the ones in eqs. (3.15).

In the Wess–Zumino gauge $D_{-q}|_{\eta=0} = \partial_{-q}$ one can use local transformations with parameters

$$D_{[-q_1}D_{-q_2]}\Lambda^m|_{\eta=0},\ ...,\ D_{[-q_1}\cdots D_{-q_{n-1}]}\Lambda^m|_{\eta=0}$$

to put all components of $e^m_{-q}(z)$ to zero except for

$$\frac{1}{n}D_{-q}e^m_{-q}|_{\eta=0} = e^m_{--}(\xi), \tag{3.36}$$

which is a light–cone component of the inverse zweibein (3.2). In this gauge the constraint (3.33) is identically satisfied. If we then impose on the worldsheet zweibein the conformal gauge $e^m_a(\tau,\sigma) = \delta^m_a$, the covariant derivatives (3.27) and (3.28) become flat, and the superdiffeomorphisms (3.34) reduce to the chiral (heterotic) superconformal $(n,0)$ transformations

$$\delta\xi^{--} \equiv \delta(\tau-\sigma) = \Lambda^{--}(\xi^{--},\eta^{-q}) - \frac{1}{2}\eta^{-q}D_{-q}\Lambda^{--}, \quad \delta\eta^-_q = -\frac{i}{2}D_{-q}\Lambda^{--}; \tag{3.37}$$

$$\delta\xi^{++} \equiv \delta(\tau+\sigma) = \Lambda^{++}(\xi^{++}).$$

We are now in a position to write down the superembedding condition for the $N=1$, $D=3,4,6,10$ superstring. It again prescribes that in the basis (3.26) the Grassmann component of the superworldsheet pullback of the target space supervielbein $\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}(Z)$ (2.20) is zero

$$\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{-q}(Z(z)) = D_{-q}X^{\underline{a}} - iD_{-q}\bar{\Theta}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\Theta = 0. \tag{3.38}$$

The only difference between eq. (3.38) and the superembedding condition for the $N=1$ superparticles is that now D_{-q} contains the zweibein components $e^m_{-q}(z)$.

The analysis of the superembedding condition (3.38) is carried out in exactly the same way as the superparticle case (Subsection 2.5.3) and results in the same conclusions [33, 40]:

i) All higher components in the expansion of the superfields $X^{\underline{m}}(\xi,\eta)$ and $\Theta^{\underline{\mu}}(\xi,\eta)$ are expressed in terms of the leading components $x^{\underline{m}}(\xi)$ and $\theta^{\underline{\mu}}(\xi)$ which are dynamical variables of the superstrings.

ii) The dynamical equations of motion (3.16) of $x^{\underline{m}}(\xi)$ and $\theta^{\underline{\mu}}(\xi)$ do not follow from the superembedding condition.

iii) One of the Virasoro constraints (3.18) of the $N = 1$ superstrings appears as a consequence of (3.38) which produces the Cartan–Penrose relation

$$\delta_{qr}\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{--} \equiv \delta_{qr}\left(D_{--}X^{\underline{a}} - iD_{--}\bar{\Theta}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\Theta\right) = D_{-q}\bar{\Theta}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}D_{-r}\Theta \tag{3.39}$$

$$\Rightarrow \quad \mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{--}\mathcal{E}_{--\underline{a}} = 0. \tag{3.40}$$

iv) Because of the relation (3.39), the κ–symmetry (3.12) of the $N = 1$ Green–Schwarz formulation ($\theta^2 = 0$) is identified with local worldsheet supersymmetry.

v) The superstring dynamical equations and the second Virasoro condition should be derived from a worldsheet superfield action in $N = 1$, $D = 3, 4, 6, 10$ target superspace.

We start to construct this action by writing down the term which produces the superembedding condition (3.38)

$$S_0 = -i\int d^2\xi d^n\eta P^{-q}_{\underline{a}}\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{-q} = -i\int d^2\xi d^n\eta P^{-q}_{\underline{a}}\left[D_{-q}X^{\underline{a}} - iD_{-q}\bar{\Theta}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\Theta\right], \tag{3.41}$$

where $n = D - 2$.

To this action one should, in principle, add a Lagrange multiplier term which takes into account the superworldsheet geometry constraint (3.33), but since this constraint is identically satisfied in the Wess–Zumino gauge (3.36) such a term is purely auxiliary and does not contribute to the component superstring action [40]. We therefore skip this term.

As in the superparticle case the action (3.41) is invariant under the local transformations of the Lagrange multiplier

$$\delta P^{-q}_{\underline{a}}(z) = (D_{-r} + i\partial_m e^m_{-r})(\Lambda^{qrs}_{++}\Gamma_{\underline{a}}D_{-s}\Theta), \tag{3.42}$$

where the parameter $\Lambda^{qrs}_{++\underline{\alpha}}(z)$ is totally symmetric and traceless with respect to the each pair of the $SO(n)$ indices q, r, s.

Again, as in the superparticle case, this symmetry allows one to reduce the number of independent components of the superfield $P^{-q}_{\underline{a}}(z)$, and to express the remaining ones in terms of components of $\Theta^{\underline{\mu}}(z)$ by solving the equations of motion

$$(D_{-q} + i\partial_m e^m_{-q})P^{-q}_{\underline{a}} = 0, \qquad P^{-q}_{\underline{a}}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}D_{-q}\Theta = 0. \tag{3.43}$$

The action (3.41), however, does not describe the fully fledged $N = 1$, $D = 3, 4, 6, 10$ superstrings [137]. As we shall see in the next subsection, it describes so called null (or tensionless) superstrings, extended objects which are characterized by having zero tension and a degenerate worldsheet metric [130]. The reason is that we have not yet incorporated a Wess–Zumino–like term into the worldsheet superfield action, which will generate the string tension dynamically.

3.2.1 Null superstrings

.

Null strings [130] (and in general null (super)branes or tensionless branes) have attracted certain attention from various points of view [131, 101, 132, 133, 134, 135, 102, 136]. As far as their properties are concerned the null strings are closer to the massless particles than to the strings. Actually, they describe a continuum of massless particles moving along a degenerate light–like surface [131, 135]. Moreover the null strings do not need any critical dimension of space–time to live in [132, 133] and the null superstrings [131, 134, 135], in contrast to the ordinary superstrings, do not require a Wess–Zumino term to be κ–symmetric.

It has been assumed [101, 135, 136] that the null strings and branes may be regarded as a high energy limit of the ordinary string thus providing a way for describing strings beyond the Planck's scale.

We now show that the action (3.41) describes null superstrings in $N = 1$, $D = 3, 4, 6$ and 10 superspaces [137].

For simplicity consider the case when the superworldsheet in (3.41) has only one fermionic direction (i.e. $n = 1$). This case directly corresponds to an $N = 1$, $D = 3$ superstring but the action (3.41) with $n = 1$ describes $N = 1$, $D = 4, 6$ and 10 superstrings as well, though in these higher dimensions only one of $D - 2$ κ–symmetries is manifest. The form of the hidden κ symmetries is exactly the same as in the case of superparticles (2.72)–(2.77).

Let us integrate (3.41) over the worldsheet fermionic variable and solve for algebraic equations of motion of auxiliary variables analogous to eqs. (2.43). Then the action reduces to

$$S_0 = \int d^2\xi p_{\underline{a}}^{--} \left[e_{--}^m(\xi)(\partial_m x^{\underline{a}} - i\partial_m \bar\theta \Gamma^{\underline{a}} \theta) - \bar\lambda_- \Gamma^{\underline{a}} \lambda_- \right], \tag{3.44}$$

where

$$p_{\underline{a}}^{--}(\xi) = P_{\underline{a}}^{--}(z)|_{\eta=0}, \quad \lambda_-^{\underline{\mu}} = D_- \Theta^{\underline{\mu}}(z)|_{\eta=0}, \quad e_{--}^m(\xi) = D_- e_-^m(z)|_{\eta=0}.$$

As in the superparticle case, from the action (3.44) we derive the Cartan–Penrose relations

$$p_{\underline{a}}^{--} = e^{-4}(\xi) \bar\lambda_- \Gamma_{\underline{a}} \lambda_-$$

$$\mathcal{E}_{--}^{\underline{a}}(\xi) = e_{--}^m(\xi)(\partial_m x^{\underline{a}} - i\partial_m \bar\theta \Gamma^{\underline{a}} \theta) = \bar\lambda_- \Gamma^{\underline{a}} \lambda_- = \frac{1}{e^{-4}} p^{--\underline{a}}, \tag{3.45}$$

where $e^{-4}(\xi)$ is a proportionality coefficient with four 'upper minus' $SO(1,1)$ indices.

Eq. (3.45) implies that $\mathcal{E}_{--}^{\underline{a}}$ satisfies the Virasoro constraint (3.40).

In addition the variation of (3.44) with respect to e_{--}^m gives

$$p_{\underline{a}}^{--}(\partial_m x^{\underline{a}} - i\partial_m \bar\theta \Gamma^{\underline{a}} \theta) = 0, \tag{3.46}$$

which in view of (3.45) implies

$$e^n_{--}\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_n\mathcal{E}_{m\underline{a}} = 0. \tag{3.47}$$

From eq. (3.47) it follows that (if e^n_{--} is nonzero, which we assume) the induced worldsheet metric

$$G_{mn} = \mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_m\mathcal{E}_{n\underline{a}} \tag{3.48}$$

is degenerate

$$\det G_{mn} = 0.$$

This is a characteristic feature of the null strings and branes.

Making use of the relations (3.45) and introducing instead of e^m_{--} the worldvolume vector

$$V^m(\xi) = \sqrt{e^{-4}}e^m_{--},$$

we can rewrite the action (3.44) so that it takes the form of the null superstring action considered, for example, in [135]

$$S_0 = \int d^2\xi V^m V^n \left(\partial_m x^{\underline{m}} - i\partial_m\bar\theta\Gamma^{\underline{m}}\theta\right)\left(\partial_n x_{\underline{m}} - i\partial_n\bar\theta\Gamma_{\underline{m}}\theta\right). \tag{3.49}$$

One gets exactly the same form (3.49) of the null superstring action from the action (3.41) with $n = D-2$, though, the procedure becomes a bit more complicated because of the much greater number of auxiliary fields entering the initial superfield action.

Thus the doubly supersymmetric action (3.41) describes $N = 1$, $D = 3, 4, 6, 10$ null superstrings. Note that in contrast to the Green–Schwarz action the null superstring action (3.49) does not contain the Wess–Zumino term. However it is still κ–symmetric (which is the relic of the linearly realized worldsheet supersymmetry of the action (3.41)). The κ–symmetry transformations are

$$\delta_\kappa\theta^\alpha = iV^m\left(\partial_m x^{\underline{m}} - i\partial_m\bar\theta\Gamma^{\underline{m}}\theta\right)\gamma^\alpha_{\underline{m}\beta}\kappa^\beta, \quad \delta_\kappa x^m = -i\bar\theta\Gamma^m\delta_\kappa\theta,$$

$$\delta_\kappa V^m = 2V^m V^n\partial_n\bar\theta\kappa.$$

To get a doubly supersymmetric action for the fully fledged $N = 1$ superstrings we should add to the action (3.41) a term which would generate the string tension and make the worldsheet metric nondegenerate. Such a term should reproduce the Wess–Zumino term of the Green–Schwarz formulation.

The treatment of the string tension as a dynamical variable has been discussed in various aspects [101, 102, 103]. In particular, it allows one to construct superbrane actions which are manifestly target–space supersymmetric [102, 138, 139, 103], i.e. do not contain the standard Wess–Zumino term. The replacement of tension with the worldvolume p-form field is also useful when one deals with branes ending on other branes [138].

3.2.2 String tension generating mechanism

Before considering the doubly supersymmetric case let us first show how one can extend the null superstring component action (3.44) to describe the standard $N = 1$ superstring. This construction is similar to that of references [102] and is analogous to the super–Maxwell coupling of the superparticles discussed in Subsection 2.6.

One introduces an 'electromagnetic' field $A_m(\xi)$ on the superstring worldsheet and constructs a worldsheet two–form which is invariant under the target space supersymmetry transformations (2.19). The appropriate two–form is

$$\mathcal{F}^{(2)} = e^{--}e^{++}\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{--}\mathcal{E}^{\underline{b}}_{++}\eta_{\underline{ab}} + B^{(2)} + dA. \tag{3.50}$$

It includes the worldsheet pullback of the Wess–Zumino form (3.11) (where $\theta^2 = 0$ because we deal with $N = 1$), i.e.

$$B^{(2)} = idx^{\underline{a}}d\bar{\theta}\Gamma_{\underline{a}}\theta, \tag{3.51}$$

and $e^{++} = d\xi^m e^{++}_m(\xi)$ and $e^{--} = d\xi^m e^{--}_m(\xi)$ are the light–cone components of the zweibein (3.1), (3.2).

Since under the supersymmetry transformations $B^{(2)}$ transforms as a total derivative

$$\delta B^{(2)} = id\left[(dx^{\underline{a}} - \frac{i}{3}d\bar{\theta}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\theta)\bar{\theta}\Gamma_{\underline{a}}\epsilon\right]$$

the vector field $A_m(\xi)$ must also vary as

$$\delta A = -i(dx^{\underline{a}} - \frac{i}{3}d\bar{\theta}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\theta)\bar{\theta}\Gamma_{\underline{a}}\epsilon$$

to cancel the variation of $B^{(2)}$ in (3.50).

The vector field $A_m(\xi)$ should not be a new propagating worldsheet field since our aim is to describe the ordinary superstrings which do not carry such fields. Hence we must require that on the mass shell $A_m(\xi)$ is expressed in terms of superstring dynamical variables. This is achieved by assuming that the two–form (3.50) vanishes on the mass shell, i.e.

$$dA = -e^{--}e^{++}\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{--}\mathcal{E}^{\underline{b}}_{++}\eta_{\underline{ab}} - B^{(2)}. \tag{3.52}$$

Eq. (3.52) implies that the field strength of $A_m(\xi)$ is not independent and hence does not describe new redundant physical degrees of freedom. From eq. (3.52) it also follows that its r.h.s. is a closed form, which is true for any two–form on a $d = 2$ bosonic manifold.

To get eq. (3.52) as an equation of motion we add to the action (3.44) the term

$$S_T = \int d^2\xi\phi(\xi)\epsilon^{mn}\left[e^{--}_m e^{++}_n \mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{--}\mathcal{E}^{\underline{b}}_{++}\eta_{\underline{ab}} + B^{(2)}_{mn} + \partial_m A_n\right], \tag{3.53}$$

where $\phi(\xi)$ is a Lagrange multiplier whose variation gives rise to eq. (3.52).

The extended action (3.44)+(3.53)

$$S = S_0 + S_T \tag{3.54}$$

is invariant under new local transformations found in [33, 40]

$$\delta p^{--\underline{a}} = \Lambda^{--}_{++}(\xi)\epsilon^{mn}e^{++}_m e^{--}_n(\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{--} + \bar{\lambda}_-\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\lambda_-)\phi(\xi) \tag{3.55}$$

$$\delta e^n_{++} = \Lambda^{--}_{++}(\xi)e^n_{--}, \qquad \delta e^n_{--} = 0.$$

If $\phi(\xi)$ is nonzero this symmetry allows one to eliminate $p^{--}_{\underline{a}}$ on the mass shell when the eqs. (3.45) hold.

Let us now see how the string tension appears, and the Green–Schwarz action is recovered. Varying (3.53) with respect to A_m we get

$$\partial_m\phi = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \phi = T, \tag{3.56}$$

where T is an integration constant.

If T is nonzero, and we substitute (3.56) into the action (3.53), the term $\epsilon^{mn}\partial_m A_n$ becomes a total derivative and can be skipped. As a result the action S_T (3.53) reduces to the $N = 1$ Green–Schwarz action (3.10) (with $\theta^2 = 0$). The first term of the Green–Schwarz action is nothing but the first term in (3.53), which can be checked using the expressions (3.2)–(3.6). We see that T is the string tension.

Moreover, when ϕ (and hence T) is nonzero the local transformations (3.55) allow one to put $p^{--}_{\underline{a}}$ satisfying (3.45) to zero. Thus the term S_0 (3.44) drops out of the extended action (3.54) and the latter coincides with the $N = 1$ Green–Schwarz action

$$S_{N=1} = T\int d^2\xi\epsilon^{mn}\left[e^{--}_m e^{++}_n\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{--}\mathcal{E}^{\underline{b}}_{++}\eta_{\underline{ab}} + B^{(2)}_{mn}\right]. \tag{3.57}$$

On the contrary, when $T = 0$ the second term S_T (3.53) disappears from (3.54) and it reduces to the null superstring action (3.44). Therefore, eq. (3.54) is the generic action which is nonsingular in the tensionless limit and describes superstrings with all values of the tension.

Our next step is to lift the action S_T on to the worldsheet superspace.

So now we consider the two–form (3.50) given on the superworldsheet $\mathcal{M}_{2,n}$, i.e. all its ingredients depend on $z^M = (\xi^m, \eta^{-q})$.

3.2.3 Weil triviality

An interesting observation concerning properties of the two–superform (3.50) on $\mathcal{M}_{2,n}$ was made in [33, 140].

The two–superform $\mathcal{F}^{(2)}$ is closed on $\mathcal{M}_{2,n}$ when the superembedding condition (3.38) is satisfied. The closure of a two–form on $\mathcal{M}_{2,n}$ is a nontrivial property because of the presence of n Grassmann directions.

Let us check this property, but first rewrite (3.50) in a more appropriate form

$$\mathcal{F}^{(2)} = \mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}} \wedge e^{++}\mathcal{E}_{++\underline{a}} + B^{(2)} + dA. \tag{3.58}$$

By definition of the pullback

$$\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}} = e^{--}\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{--} + e^{++}\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{++} + e^{-q}\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{-q}, \tag{3.59}$$

we see that if the superembedding condition $\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{-q} = 0$ (3.38) holds, the form (3.58) coincides with (3.50).

Then, in view of the definition of $B^{(2)}$ (3.51),

$$d\mathcal{F}^{(2)} = d\left(\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}} e^{++}\mathcal{E}_{++\underline{a}}\right) + dB^{(2)} =$$

$$= -(d\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}})e^{++}\mathcal{E}_{++\underline{a}} + \mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}} d(e^{++}\mathcal{E}_{++\underline{a}}) + i\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}} d\bar{\Theta}\Gamma_{\underline{a}} d\Theta. \tag{3.60}$$

Because of the target–space torsion constraint (2.21) and the expansion (3.59), the first term of (3.60) can be rewritten as

$$-id\bar{\Theta}\Gamma_{\underline{a}} d\Theta e^{++}\mathcal{E}_{++\underline{a}} = -id\bar{\Theta}\Gamma_{\underline{a}} d\Theta \mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}} + id\bar{\Theta}\Gamma_{\underline{a}} d\Theta \left(e^{--}\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{--} + e^{-q}\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{-q}\right). \tag{3.61}$$

If the superembedding condition (3.38) and its consequences (3.39) and (3.40) are satisfied, the last two terms of (3.61) vanish, and the first term cancels the last term in (3.60).

By virtue of the worldsheet torsion constraints (3.25) and the superembedding conditions (3.38)–(3.40) the second term in (3.60) also vanishes

$$\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}} d(e^{++}\mathcal{E}_{++\underline{a}}) = e^{--}\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{--} e^{++} e^{-q}\nabla_{-q}\mathcal{E}_{++\underline{a}} \sim$$

$$\sim e^{--}\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{--} e^{++} e^{-q} D_{++}\bar{\Theta}\Gamma_{\underline{a}} D_{-q}\Theta = 0. \tag{3.62}$$

The transition to the expression after the similarity sign $\sim$ has been made by getting the expression for $e^{++}e^{-q}\nabla_{-q}\mathcal{E}_{++\underline{a}}$ as a component of the tangent space torsion constraint (2.21), $d\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}} = -id\Theta\Gamma^{\underline{a}} d\Theta$, in the worldsheet supervielbein basis and taking into account (3.25) and (3.38)–(3.40).

We thus get

$$d\mathcal{F}^{(2)} = \Phi^{-q}_{\underline{a}}\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{-q} + \Phi^{--\{qr\}}_{\underline{a}} D_{-r}\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{-q} = 0, \tag{3.63}$$

where Φ are some three–superforms.

The variation of $\mathcal{F}^{(2)}$ with respect to the $\mathcal{M}_{2,n}$ superdiffeomorphisms $z'^M = z^M + \delta z^M(\xi,\eta)$ is

$$\delta\mathcal{F}^{(2)} = d(i_\delta\mathcal{F}^{(2)}) + i_\delta d\mathcal{F}^{(2)}. \tag{3.64}$$

Now take the integral of $\mathcal{F}^{(2)}$ over the two–dimensional slice of $\mathcal{M}_{2,n}$ such that $\eta^{-r} = 0$, i.e. take the integral over the ordinary worldsheet

$$S_T = T\int_{\mathcal{M}_2}\mathcal{F}^{(2)}. \tag{3.65}$$

Eq. (3.65) is nothing but the action (3.53) where $\phi(\xi)$ is replaced with T (the term with $A_m(\xi)$ is a total derivative and can be skipped).

The variation of (3.65) with respect to the worldsheet superdiffeomorphisms (3.64) is (up to a total derivative)

$$\delta S_T = T \int_{\mathcal{M}_2} i_\delta d\mathcal{F}^{(2)}. \tag{3.66}$$

Since $d\mathcal{F}^{(2)}$ (3.63) is 'proportional' to the superembedding condition, the variation of S_T can be canceled by an appropriate variation of the Lagrange multiplier of the action (3.41) if we take the sum of the two actions.

Thus, the action

$$S = -i \int d^2\xi d^n\eta P_{\underline{a}}^{-q} \mathcal{E}_{-q}^{\underline{a}} + T \int_{\mathcal{M}_2} \mathcal{F}^{(2)} \tag{3.67}$$

possesses local $n = D - 2$ worldsheet supersymmetry though the second term is not an integral over the whole superworldsheet. As we have learned in the previous subsection the component version of this action describes $N = 1$, $D = 3, 4, 6, 10$ superstrings.

The doubly supersymmetric action in the form (3.67) was proposed in [33]. The property of $\mathcal{F}^{(2)}$ to be a closed superform up to the superembedding condition and the corresponding nonmanifest superdiffeomorphism invariance of the action (3.67) was called Weil triviality, a property which had been found to be useful for studying chiral anomalies in super Yang–Mills theories [141]. Actually, the action (3.65) is a particular example of the generalized actions of the group manifold (rheonomic) approach to the description of supersymmetric field theories [73] and superbranes [197].

3.2.4 Worldsheet superfield action

To make the action S_T (3.65) manifestly supersymmetric on the superworldsheet one constructs a Lagrange multiplier term [40] which produces the on–shell condition

$$\mathcal{F}^{(2)} = 0. \tag{3.68}$$

The superstring action which includes such a term is

$$S = S_0 + S_T = -i \int d^2\xi d^n\eta P_{\underline{a}}^{-q} \mathcal{E}_{-q}^{\underline{a}} + \int d^2\xi d^n\eta P^{MN} \mathcal{F}_{MN}^{(2)}, \tag{3.69}$$

where now

$$S_T = \int d^2\xi d^n\eta P^{MN} \mathcal{F}_{MN}^{(2)} = \int d^2\xi d^n\eta P^{MN} \left[\mathcal{E}_{[M}^{\underline{a}} e_{N\}}^{++} \mathcal{E}_{++\underline{a}} + B_{MN}^{(2)} + \partial_{[M} A_{N\}} \right]. \tag{3.70}$$

$[,\}$ denotes graded antisymmetrization of the superworldsheet indices (i.e. if one or both of the indices M, N are bosonic they are antisymmetrized, and if both of them are fermionic they are symmetrized).

In addition to all symmetries discussed above the action (3.69) is invariant under the local transformations of the Lagrange multiplier P^{MN}

$$\delta P^{[MN\}} = \partial_L \Lambda^{[LMN\}}(z). \tag{3.71}$$

Indeed, the variation of the S_T term (3.70) with respect to (3.71) is

$$\delta S_T = \int d^2\xi d^n\eta \Lambda^{[LMN\}} (d\mathcal{F}^{(2)})_{LMN}, \tag{3.72}$$

where $d\mathcal{F}^{(2)}$ has the form of eq. (3.63), and, hence, the variation (3.72) is canceled by an appropriate variation of the Lagrange multiplier $P_{\underline{a}}^{-q}$ in (3.69).

Varying the action (3.70) with respect to A_M we get

$$\partial_M P^{[MN\}} = 0, \tag{3.73}$$

whose general solution is

$$P^{[MN\}} = \partial_L \tilde{\Lambda}^{[LMN\}}(z) + \frac{1}{n!}\epsilon_{q_1\dots q_n}\eta^{-q_1}....\eta^{-q_n}\delta^{[M}_{--}\delta^{N\}}_{++}T, \tag{3.74}$$

where T is a constant.

The first term in (3.74) can be put to zero by gauge fixing the local transformations (3.71). Then, substituting (3.74) (with $\tilde{\Lambda} = 0$) back into the action (3.69) we see that upon the η–integration it reduces to (3.67).

We have thus demonstrated that the worldsheet superfield action (3.69) describes the $N = 1$, $D = 3, 4, 6, 10$ superstrings.

Note that in the case when the superworldsheet has only one fermionic direction, i.e. when $n = 1$, there exists another form of the superfield action S_T [33], which involves only one Grassmann component $B^{(2)}_{-,++}$ of the $\mathcal{M}_{2,1}$ pullback of the two–form $B^{(2)}$ (3.51). In this form the full action is

$$S = S_0 + S_T = -i\int d^2\xi d\eta_- P_{\underline{a}}^{--}\mathcal{E}_-^{\underline{a}} + T\int d^2\xi d\eta_- sdet(e) B^{(2)}_{-,++}, \tag{3.75}$$

where $sdet(e)$ is the superdeterminant of the supervielbein matrix e_M^A (3.30).

In Subsection 3.2 (eqs. (3.38)–(3.40)) we demonstrated that the superembedding condition gives rise only to one of the superstring Virasoro constraints. The second constraint, namely $\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{++}\mathcal{E}_{++\underline{a}} = 0$, arises as a result of the variation of the full action (in any of its forms, (3.67), (3.69) or (3.75)) with respect to the supervielbein component e^m_{--}. A completely 'twistorized' version of the doubly supersymmetric action for the $N = 1$ superstrings, where both Virasoro constraints have a twistor origin, was constructed in [142].

3.3 Coupling to supergravity background

The generalization of the superstring action (3.69) to describe a superstring propagating in curved target superspace introduced in Subsection 2.7 is almost straightforward [33, 40]. In (3.69) and (3.70) one should replace the flat supervielbeins with curved ones $\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{-q} \to E^{\underline{a}}_{-q}$, consider $B^{(2)}(Z)$ as a two–form gauge superfield, whose leading component $B_{\underline{mn}}(X)$ is

the Neveu–Schwarz gauge potential entering the supergravity multiplet, and introduce a dilaton superfield $\Phi(Z)$ coupling by redefining $\mathcal{F}^{(2)}(Z)$ as follows

$$\mathcal{F}^{(2)}_{MN} = e^{\Phi} E^{\underline{a}}_{[M} e^{++}_{N\}} E_{++\underline{a}} + B^{(2)}_{MN} + \partial_{[M} A_{N\}}. \tag{3.76}$$

The superstring action takes the form

$$S = S_0 + S_T = -i \int d^2\xi d^n\eta P^{-q}_{\underline{a}} E^{\underline{a}}_{-q} + \int d^2\xi d^n\eta P^{MN} \mathcal{F}^{(2)}_{MN}. \tag{3.77}$$

By construction (3.77) is superdiffeomorphism invariant on the superworldsheet and in the target superspace, and it must also be invariant under the variation (3.71) of the Lagrange multiplier P^{MN}. This means that the variation (3.72) of the action (3.77) must be compensated by an appropriate variation of the Lagrange multiplier $P^{-q}_{\underline{a}}$. For this, $d\mathcal{F}^{(2)}$ must have the form of the l.h.s. of eq. (3.63), i.e.

$$d\mathcal{F}^{(2)} = \Phi^{-q}_{\underline{a}} E^{\underline{a}}_{-q} + \Phi^{-\{qr\}}_{\underline{a}} D_{-r} E^{\underline{a}}_{-q}. \tag{3.78}$$

Performing the direct computation of the external differential of (3.76) one finds that it has the form of eq. (3.78) if the superbackground satisfies the supergravity torsion constraint (2.139)

$$T^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}} = -2i(C\Gamma^{\underline{a}})_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}}, \tag{3.79}$$

and the components of the field strength $H^{(3)} = dB^{(2)}$ of the two–from gauge superfield are constrained as follows

$$H_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}\underline{a}} = 2ie^{\Phi(Z)}(C\Gamma_{\underline{a}})_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}}, \qquad H_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}\underline{\gamma}} = 0 \tag{3.80}$$

(where $\Phi(Z)$ is the dilaton field).

Thus, as in the case of the Green–Schwarz formulation, the consistency of coupling the doubly supersymmetric strings to the supergravity background demands that the superbackground obeys the supergravity constraints (3.79) and (3.80). In $D = 10$ these constraints put $N = 1$ supergravity on the mass shell [128, 97].

3.4 Heterotic fermions

So far we have dealt with classical $N = 1$ superstrings in space–time of dimensions $D = 3, 4, 6$ and 10. Quantum consistency of superstring theory singles out 10–dimensional space–time. In addition, to be anomaly free a closed $N = 1$, $D = 10$ superstring should be heterotic [143], i.e. it should contain extra (heterotic) matter on its worldvolume which upon quantization produces an $N = 1$, $D = 10$ super–Yang–Mills field $A_{\underline{M}}(Z)$ taking its values in the adjoint representation of the gauge group $SO(32)$ or $E_8 \times E_8$. Such worldsheet matter fields can be 32 chiral fermions $\psi^{-\mathcal{A}}(\xi)$, where '$-$' is the chiral spinor index of the $d = 2$ Lorentz group $SO(1,1)$ and $\mathcal{A} = 1, \cdots, 32$ is the index of the 32–dimensional vector representation of the target–space gauge group $SO(32)$. Therefore,

the chiral fermions can be minimally coupled to the $SO(32)$ gauge superfield $A_{\underline{M}}^{[\mathcal{AB}]}(Z)$. Note that $\psi^{-\mathcal{A}}(\xi)$ cannot be minimally coupled to a gauge field of the $E_8 \times E_8$ group whose lowest–dimensional representation is $496 = 2 \times 248$. The $E_8 \times E_8$ gauge fields appear in heterotic string theory in a much more subtle way (see, for instance, [1]) and we shall not describe them here.

Our aim now is to introduce the heterotic fermions into the superembedding approach.

In the Green–Schwarz formulation the heterotic fermion term, which is added to the $N = 1$, $D = 10$ superstring action (3.57), is

$$S_\psi = \frac{i}{2} T \int d^2\xi \psi^- e^m_{--}(\xi)(\partial_m - \partial_m Z^{\underline{M}} A_{\underline{M}})\psi^-. \tag{3.81}$$

Varying (3.81) with respect to ψ^- we get the equation of motion which has the form of a chirality condition on ψ^-

$$e^m_{--}(\partial_m - \omega_m{}^{-+} - \partial_m Z^{\underline{M}} A_{\underline{M}})\psi^- = 0, \tag{3.82}$$

where $\omega_m{}^{-+}(\xi)$ is a worldsheet spin connection.

In the conformal gauge $e^m_{--}(\xi) = \delta^m_{--}$ and when $A_{\underline{M}} = 0$ eq. (3.82) reduces to

$$\partial_{--}\psi^{-\mathcal{A}} = 0 \tag{3.83}$$

which implies that the heterotic fermions are worldsheet left–movers

$$\psi^{-\mathcal{A}} = \psi^{-\mathcal{A}}(\xi^{++}) = \psi^{-\mathcal{A}}(\tau + \sigma). \tag{3.84}$$

For comparison let us note that in the conformal gauge the equations of motion of $\theta(\xi)$ deduced from the $N = 1$ Green–Schwarz action (3.57) imply that $\theta(\xi)$ are right–movers, i.e.

$$\theta^{\underline{\alpha}} = \theta^{\underline{\alpha}}(\xi^{--}) = \theta^{\underline{\alpha}}(\tau - \sigma).$$

Under the κ–symmetry transformations (3.12)–(3.15) the heterotic fermions transform as follows

$$\delta_\kappa \psi^- = \bar{A}_{\underline{\alpha}} (\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{--} \Gamma_{\underline{a}})^{\underline{\alpha}}_{\underline{\beta}} \kappa^{\underline{\beta}}_{++} \psi^-. \tag{3.85}$$

Therefore, they are inert with respect to the κ–transformations when the SYM background is switched off (note that when $N = 1$, from (3.12)–(3.15) it follows that $\delta_\kappa e^m_{--} = 0$).

We would like to extend the heterotic fermion action (3.81) and the chirality condition (3.82) to the superworldsheet formulation of the heterotic string whose $N = 1$, $D = 10$ target–superspace part is described by the action (3.69).

The generalization of the chirality condition (3.82) is straightforward. We consider the heterotic fermions as worldsheet superfields $\Psi^{-\mathcal{A}}(\xi^m, \eta^{-q})$ and assume that on the mass shell they satisfy the equation of motion

$$\left[D_{-q} - D_{-q} Z^{\underline{M}} A_{\underline{M}}\right] \Psi^- = 0, \tag{3.86}$$

where the covariant derivative D_{-q} was determined in eq. (3.28).

It can be easily checked that in the Wess–Zumino gauge (3.36), eq. (3.86) reduces to eq. (3.82), and hence, in the conformal gauge and in the absence of the SYM background, the heterotic fermions Ψ^- are chiral (3.84) and do not transform under the 'left–moving' conformal supersymmetry transformations (3.37), which is in agreement with their κ–symmetry properties (3.85).

Note that, as usual, κ–symmetry, or (in the worldsheet superfield formulation) the integrability of (3.86) requires the SYM constraints (2.117) and (2.118) on the background gauge field $A_{\underline{M}}$.

Now the problem is to get the equation (3.86) from a worldsheet n-extended superspace action.

When $n = 1$, the action (3.81) admits the straightforward generalization

$$S_\psi = -\frac{T}{2}\int d^2\xi d\eta_- \Psi^-(D_- - D_- Z^{\underline{M}} A_{\underline{M}})\Psi^-. \tag{3.87}$$

When $n = 2$ there is a generalization of (3.87) in terms of complex chiral $n = 2$ superfields [33].

For the worldsheet supersymmetry formulation with $n > 2$ different forms of the superfield action of chiral fermions were proposed [144, 145, 146]. The most elegant formulation, which we shall sketch for $n = 8$, was proposed by P. Howe [145].

Let us split the 32–dimensional index $\mathcal{A}$ of $\psi^{-\mathcal{A}}(z)$ into an index $i = 1, ..., 8$ and an index $\mathcal{A}' = 1, 2, 3, 4$, and identify the index i with the index of the vector representation of the group of internal isomorphisms $SO(8)$ of the $n = 8$ worldsheet supersymmetry (remember that η^{-q} transform under a spinor representation of $SO(8)$). The index $\mathcal{A}'$ labels the vector representation of a target superspace gauge group $SO(4)$ and $A_{\underline{M}}^{[\mathcal{A}'\mathcal{B}']}(Z)$ are now $SO(4)$–gauge fields which the heterotic fermions can couple to. Note that the possible minimal coupling of the heterotic fermions is now reduced from $SO(32)$ gauge coupling to $SO(4)$ coupling. This is a shortcoming of the present formulation which, however, seems to be akin to the general problem of directly coupling $E_8 \times E_8$ gauge fields mentioned at the beginning of this subsection.

Assume that *off the mass shell* the superfield $\psi^{-i\mathcal{A}'}(z)$ satisfies the constraint

$$\hat{\nabla}_{-q}\psi^{-i} \equiv \left(\delta^i_j D_{-q} - \omega_{-q,-j}{}^{-i} - \delta^i_j D_{-q} Z^{\underline{M}} A_{\underline{M}}\right)\psi^{-j} = \gamma^i_{qq'} P^{q'}, \tag{3.88}$$

where $\omega_{-q,-j}{}^{-i}$ is an $SO(1,1) \times SO(8)$ superworldsheet connection, the $SO(8)$ gamma–matrices have already been introduced in (2.94), and $P^{q'\mathcal{A}'}(z)$ is a superfield in the spinor representation of $SO(8)$ 'dual' to that of η^{-q}.

On the mass shell $P^{q'\mathcal{A}'}(z)$ should vanish and then eq. (3.88) reduces to the chirality condition analogous to (3.86)

$$P^{q'} = \hat{\nabla}_{-q}\psi^{-i} = 0, \tag{3.89}$$

thus, providing us with the equations of motion of the heterotic fermions.

It seems instructive to note that the constraint (3.88) resembles the superembedding condition (3.38), and, indeed, (3.38) reduces to the exactly the same form when the local worldsheet supersymmetry is gauge fixed as in eqs. (2.99) and (2.100). To see this, take the transverse part of (3.38) which, in view of eqs. (2.94)–(2.100), is

$$D_{-q}X^i - i\eta^{-p}\gamma^i_{pq'}D_{-q}\Theta^{q'}_- - i\gamma^i_{qq'}\Theta^{q'}_- = 0, \tag{3.90}$$

$$i = 1, ..., 8; \quad q = 1, ..., 8; \quad q' = 1, ..., 8\,.$$

The second term of (3.90) can be 'absorbed' by redefining the transverse coordinate $X^i = \hat{X}^i - i\eta^{-p}\gamma^i_{pq'}\Theta^{q'}_-$, and we finally get

$$D_{-q}\hat{X}^i = 2i\gamma^i_{qq'}\Theta^{q'}_-, \tag{3.91}$$

whose form is the same as that of the constraint (3.88).

The constraint (3.88) can be explicitly solved [145], the solution being in terms of an unconstrained superfield $V^{-8\mathcal{A}'}_{q'}(z)$ (with eight $SO(1,1)$ minuses)

$$\psi^{-i} = \gamma^i_{qq'}\Delta^7_{-q}V^{-8}_{q'}, \tag{3.92}$$

where Δ^7_{-q} is a differential operator of a 7-th power in $\hat{\nabla}_{-q}$ whose explicit form the reader can find in ref. [145].

The action which gives rise to eq. (3.89) is

$$S_\psi = \int d^2\xi d^8\eta_-\ sdet(e)V^{-8}_{q'}P^{q'}, \tag{3.93}$$

where under $P^{q'}$ one should imply eq. (3.88) with ψ^{-i} being replaced by its 'prepotential' (3.92).

This completes the construction of the manifest doubly supersymmetric formulation of the $N = 1$, $D = 10$ heterotic string, and we now briefly discuss the case of

3.5 Type II superstrings

As we have already mentioned at the end of Subsection 3.1, to replace the κ–symmetry of the $N = 2$ superstring action in the Green–Schwarz formulation (3.10) with local worldsheet supersymmetry one should deal with an (n, n) worldsheet superspace parametrized by bosonic coordinates ξ^m $(m = 0, 1)$ and $2n = 2(D-2)$ worldsheet spinor coordinates $\eta^{\alpha q}$ $(\alpha = -, +;\ q = 1, ..., D-2)$. The basic condition specifying the superembedding of such a supersurface into an $N = 2$ target superspace parametrized by supercoordinates $Z^{\underline{M}} = (X^{\underline{m}}, \Theta^{I\underline{\mu}})$ $(I = 1, 2)$ is

$$E^{\underline{a}}_{\alpha q} = D_{\alpha q}Z^{\underline{M}}E^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{M}}(Z(z)) = 0,$$

where (as above) $D_{\alpha q}$ is a spinorial covariant derivative on the worldsheet supersurface and $E^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{M}}$ are components of the target–space supervielbein.

The content and consequences of this superembedding condition were analyzed in the references [42, 45]. It was shown that in the case of an $N = 2$, $D = 3$ superstring the superembedding condition does not contain dynamical equations of motion of the superstring coordinates and, hence, a doubly supersymmetric action for the $N = 2$, $D = 3$ superstring can be constructed in the form analogous to those of the $N = 1$ superstrings [33, 40]. In the case of IIA and IIB superstrings in ten–dimensional space–time the superembedding condition contains the dynamical equations, which was demonstrated in detail in refs. [42, 45]. This is similar to the appearance of the equations of motion in the constraints of higher dimensional super–Yang–Mills and supergravity theories, as we have mentioned above. In such cases standard superfield actions cannot be constructed, since, for example, if one tried to introduce the superembedding condition into an action with a Lagrange multiplier, Lagrange multiplier components would contain propagating (redundant) degrees of freedom which would be provided with kinetic terms by the dynamical equations contained in the superembedding condition.

Though the standard superfield actions cannot be constructed in the cases when the superembedding condition puts a superbrane theory on the mass shell, in these cases the superembedding condition contains exhaustive information about the classical dynamics of the superbranes. This is very useful when one deals with new brane objects for which a detailed worldvolume theory has not yet been developed, as it was, for instance with D–branes, and especially with the M–theory five–brane [50, 51].

We now leave the superstrings and, upon the discussion of general geometrical grounds of (super)embedding[†], turn to the consideration of M–theory branes, the $D = 11$ supermembrane and the super–5–brane, whose classical properties are completely determined by the superembedding condition.

4 Basic elements of (super)surface theory

4.1 Bosonic embedding

Consider a $(p + 1)$–dimensional bosonic surface $\mathcal{M}_{p+1}$ embedded into a D–dimensional curved bosonic target space $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_D$.

A local orthogonal basis in the cotangent space of $\mathcal{M}_{p+1}$ is given by a vielbein one–form

$$e^a(\xi^m) = d\xi^m e^a_m(\xi), \tag{4.1}$$

which transforms under the vector representation of $SO(1, p)$. The matrix $e^a_m(\xi)$ and its inverse $e^m_a(\xi)$ relate the local orthogonal basis on $\mathcal{M}_{p+1}$ to the local coordinate basis $d\xi^m$.

[†]Mathematically profound presentation of surface theory the reader may find in [7], and its extension to superembeddings in [45, 79].

They have the following properties

$$e^a_m(\xi)e^{mb}(\xi) = \eta^{ab}, \quad \eta^{ab} = (-,+,...,+),$$

$$e^a_m e^b_n \eta_{ab} = g_{mn}(\xi), \tag{4.2}$$

where $g_{mn}(\xi)$ is a metric on $\mathcal{M}_{p+1}$.

We assume that the bosonic surface has zero torsion, i.e. its connection $\omega_b{}^a(\xi) = d\xi^m \omega_{mb}{}^a$ satisfies the condition

$$T^a = de^a + e^b \omega_b{}^a = 0. \tag{4.3}$$

Similarly, in the target space $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_D$ we introduce a local orthogonal cotangent basis given by a vielbein one–form

$$E^{\underline{a}}(x^{\underline{m}}) = dx^{\underline{m}} E^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{m}}(x), \tag{4.4}$$

which transforms under the vector representation of $SO(1, D-1)$ and whose components satisfy the conditions

$$E^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{m}} E^{\underline{mb}} = \eta^{\underline{ab}}, \quad \eta^{\underline{ab}} = (-,+,...,+),$$

$$E^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{m}} E^{\underline{b}}_{\underline{n}} \eta^{\underline{ab}} = g_{\underline{mn}}(x), \tag{4.5}$$

where $g_{\underline{mn}}(x)$ is a metric on $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_D$ which is assumed to be torsion free as well

$$T^{\underline{a}} = dE^{\underline{a}} + E^{\underline{b}} \Omega_{\underline{b}}{}^{\underline{a}} = 0. \tag{4.6}$$

To embed the surface $\mathcal{M}_{p+1}$ into the target space $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_D$ means to relate the intrinsic geometry of $\mathcal{M}_{p+1}$ to the geometry of $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_D$. To this end we consider how the local $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_D$ frame $E^{\underline{a}}$ behaves on the surface, i.e consider the pullback of $E^{\underline{a}}$ on to $\mathcal{M}_{p+1}$

$$E^{\underline{a}}(x(\xi)) = d\xi^m \partial_m x^{\underline{m}} E^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{m}} = e^a E^{\underline{a}}_a, \tag{4.7}$$

where

$$E^{\underline{a}}_a(x(\xi)) \equiv e^m_a \partial_m x^{\underline{m}} E^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{m}}. \tag{4.8}$$

Since the orthogonal frame $E^{\underline{a}}$ is determined up to the local $SO(1, D-1)$ transformations, rotating it by an appropriate $SO(1, D-1)$ matrix $u_{\underline{b}}{}^{\underline{a}}(\xi)$, it is always possible to adapt its pullback on $\mathcal{M}_{p+1}$ in such a way that (up to a rescaling factor)

$$E^a \equiv E^{\underline{b}} u_{\underline{b}}{}^a = e^a, \tag{4.9}$$

$$E^i \equiv E^{\underline{b}} u_{\underline{b}}{}^i = e^b E^{\underline{b}}_b u_{\underline{b}}{}^i = 0, \tag{4.10}$$

where we have split the upper index of the $SO(1, D-1)$ matrix $u_{\underline{b}}{}^{\underline{a}}$ into the index $a = 0, 1, ..., p$ (of the $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_D$ directions parallel to $\mathcal{M}_{p+1}$) and the index $i = 1, ..., D-p-1$

(of the $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_D$ directions transverse to $\mathcal{M}_{p+1}$). These indices are, respectively, the indices of the subgroups $SO(1,p)$ and $SO(D-p-1)$ of $SO(1,D-1)$

$$u_{\underline{b}}{}^{\underline{a}} = \left(u_{\underline{b}}{}^{a},\ u_{\underline{b}}{}^{i}\right). \tag{4.11}$$

Note that, by definition, the $SO(1,D-1)$ matrix $u_{\underline{b}}{}^{\underline{a}}$ satisfies the orthogonality conditions

$$u_{\underline{c}}{}^{\underline{a}} u_{\underline{d}}{}^{\underline{b}} \eta^{\underline{cd}} = \eta^{\underline{ab}}, \quad u_{\underline{a}}{}^{\underline{c}} u_{\underline{b}}{}^{\underline{d}} \eta_{\underline{cd}} = \eta_{\underline{ab}}, \tag{4.12}$$

which are preserved by the independent left and right $SO(1,D-1)_L \times SO(1,D-1)_R$ transformations of $u_{\underline{b}}{}^{\underline{a}}$

$$\hat{u}_{\underline{b}}{}^{\underline{a}} = (O_L)_{\underline{b}}{}^{\underline{d}}\ u_{\underline{d}}{}^{\underline{c}}\ (O_R^{-1})_{\underline{c}}{}^{\underline{a}}. \tag{4.13}$$

The meaning of eqs. (4.9) and (4.10) is the following. When the surface $\mathcal{M}_{p+1}$ is embedded into $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_D$ the vielbein frame $E^{\underline{a}}$ of $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_D$ can always be chosen in such a way that the pullback onto $\mathcal{M}_{p+1}$ of $p+1$ of its components coincides with a given local frame $e^a(\xi)$ on $\mathcal{M}_{p+1}$, and the other $D-p-1$ components of $E^{\underline{a}}$ are orthogonal to the surface. With such a choice one identifies a subgroup $SO(1,p)$ of the target space group $SO(1,D-1)_R$ acting on $u_{\underline{b}}{}^{\underline{a}}$ on the right (see eq. (4.13)) with the group $SO(1,p)$ of rotations in the (co)tangent space of $\mathcal{M}_{p+1}$.

Eqs. (4.9) and (4.10) are invariant under the transformations of $SO(1,p) \times SO(D-p-1)$ of the group $SO(1,D-1)_R$ (4.13). Thus, $SO(1,D-1)_R$ is broken down to $SO(1,p) \times SO(D-p-1)$, where $SO(D-p-1)$ acts in the subspace of $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_D$ transverse to the surface $\mathcal{M}_{p+1}$. Therefore, the $SO(1,D-1)$ matrix (4.11) which brings the pullback of $E^{\underline{a}}$ to the form (4.9) and (4.10) is determined up to the $SO(1,p) \times SO(D-p-1)$ rotations. This means that its elements, which are called (Lorentz–vector) harmonics [87, 88, 91], parametrize a coset manifold $\frac{SO(1,D-1)}{SO(1,p)\times SO(D-p-1)}$.

We should stress that the left group $SO(1,D-1)_L$ of (4.13), which is associated with the local Lorentz transformations of the target–space vielbein (4.4), remains unbroken. This ensures the Lorentz–covariant description of the embedding.

The equations (4.9) and (4.10) can be regarded as embedding conditions. Their structure reflects the fact that the embedded surface $\mathcal{M}_{p+1}$ breaks the local Lorentz symmetry $SO(1,D-1)_R$ of the target space $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_D$ down to $SO(1,p) \times SO(D-p-1)$ acting in the directions parallel and transversal to $\mathcal{M}_{p+1}$. Eq. (4.9) defines the vielbein e^a on $\mathcal{M}_{p+1}$ as the vielbein induced by embedding. Using (4.5), (4.9) and (4.10) one can easily check that $E_a^{\underline{a}}$ defined in (4.8) are orthonormal[†]

$$E_a^{\underline{a}} E_{b\underline{a}} = \eta_{ab}, \tag{4.14}$$

and, hence, the $\mathcal{M}_{p+1}$ metric (4.2) is the induced metric

$$g_{mn}(\xi) = \partial_m x^{\underline{m}} \partial_n x^{\underline{n}} g_{\underline{mn}}(x(\xi)). \tag{4.15}$$

[†] Notice that in the case of strings the eq. (4.14) is equivalent to the Virasoro constraints.

Because of the orthonormality property (4.14) the components of $E_{\underline{a}}^{\underline{a}}$ can be identified with the $u_a{}^{\underline{a}}$ components of the $SO(1,D-1)$ harmonic matrix inverse to (4.11) (as usual, the Lorentz indices are raised and lowered by the Minkowski metrics)

$$E_{\underline{a}}^{\underline{a}}(x(\xi)) = u_a{}^{\underline{a}}(\xi) \equiv \eta^{\underline{ab}} u_{\underline{b}}{}^{b} \eta_{ba}. \tag{4.16}$$

Remember that by virtue of (4.12) the matrix inverse to the orthogonal matrix $u_{\underline{b}}{}^{\underline{a}}$ is

$$(u^{-1})_{\underline{b}}{}^{\underline{a}} = \eta^{\underline{ac}} u_{\underline{c}}{}^{\underline{d}} \eta_{\underline{db}} \equiv (u_a{}^{\underline{a}}, u_i{}^{\underline{a}}). \tag{4.17}$$

To simplify notation we shall always skip the superscript "-1" of the components of the inverse $SO(1,D-1)$ matrices when their lower index is decomposed into the $SO(1,p) \times SO(D-p-1)$ indices. This should not lead to a confusion if we keep in mind that only the upper index of the 'direct' $SO(1,D-1)$ matrices can be subject to $SO(1,p)\times SO(D-p-1)$ splitting, as in eq. (4.11).

We shall now show that the spin connection $\omega_b{}^a$ of the surface $\mathcal{M}_{p+1}$ is related to the pullback of the spin connection $\Omega_{\underline{b}}{}^{\underline{a}}$ of $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_D$ by local $SO(1,D-1)$ transformations of the latter.

Consider the integrability condition of eq. (4.7) by taking the $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_D$ external covariant differential $\nabla = d + \Omega$ of its left– and right–hand side. Then, in view of (4.6), (4.3) and (4.16), we get

$$e^b \omega_b{}^a u_a{}^{\underline{b}} = e^b \nabla E_b{}^{\underline{b}} \equiv e^b (du_b{}^{\underline{b}} + u_b{}^{\underline{a}} \Omega_{\underline{a}}{}^{\underline{b}}). \tag{4.18}$$

Multiplying eq. (4.18) by $u_{\underline{b}}{}^a$ and taking into account (4.12) and (4.16) we arrive at the expression[†]

$$\omega_b{}^a = \left(\nabla u_b{}^{\underline{b}}\right) u_{\underline{b}}{}^a \equiv du_b{}^{\underline{b}} u_{\underline{b}}{}^a + u_b{}^{\underline{a}} \Omega_{\underline{a}}{}^{\underline{b}} u_{\underline{b}}{}^a, \tag{4.19}$$

where $du_b{}^{\underline{b}} u_{\underline{b}}{}^a$ are $SO(1,p)$-valued components of the $SO(1,D-1)$ Cartan form

$$\Omega_{0\underline{a}}{}^{\underline{b}} \equiv d(u^{-1})_{\underline{a}}{}^{\underline{c}} u_{\underline{c}}{}^{\underline{b}} = -(u^{-1})_{\underline{a}}{}^{\underline{c}} du_{\underline{c}}{}^{\underline{b}} \tag{4.20}$$

($(u^{-1})_{\underline{a}}{}^{\underline{c}}$ was defined in (4.17)). $\Omega_{0\underline{a}}{}^{\underline{b}}$ identically satisfies the Maurer–Cartan (zero–curvature) equations

$$d\Omega_{0\underline{a}}{}^{\underline{b}} + \Omega_{0\underline{a}}{}^{\underline{c}} \Omega_{0\underline{c}}{}^{\underline{b}} = 0. \tag{4.21}$$

The integrability of the Maurer–Cartan equations is the basis for relating (super)branes to integrable systems [4, 5, 6, 8, 17]–[22].

As a generalization of (4.20) we also introduce a 'covariantized Cartan' form (which is, of course, nothing but the Lorentz–transformed spin connection Ω on $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_D$)

$$\hat{\Omega}_{\underline{a}}{}^{\underline{b}} \equiv \nabla(u^{-1})_{\underline{a}}{}^{\underline{c}} u_{\underline{c}}{}^{\underline{b}} = d(u^{-1})_{\underline{a}}{}^{\underline{c}} u_{\underline{c}}{}^{\underline{b}} + (u^{-1})_{\underline{a}}{}^{\underline{c}} \Omega_{\underline{c}}{}^{\underline{d}} u_{\underline{d}}{}^{\underline{b}}. \tag{4.22}$$

[†]Remember that the spin connections are antisymmetric with respect to the Lorentz–group indices. Note also that with such a choice of $\omega_b{}^a$ the covariant differential $\left(\hat{\nabla} u_b{}^{\underline{b}}\right) u_{\underline{b}}{}^a = (du_b{}^{\underline{b}} + u_b{}^{\underline{a}} \Omega_{\underline{a}}{}^{\underline{b}} - \omega_b{}^c u_c{}^{\underline{b}}) u_{\underline{b}}{}^a$, which contains both connections, is identically zero $\left(\hat{\nabla} u_b{}^{\underline{b}}\right) u_{\underline{b}}{}^a \equiv 0$.

Written in terms of the connection $\hat{\Omega}$, the curvature two–form on $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_D$

$$R_{\underline{a}}{}^{\underline{b}} \equiv d\Omega_{\underline{a}}{}^{\underline{b}} + \Omega_{\underline{a}}{}^{\underline{c}}\Omega_{\underline{c}}{}^{\underline{b}} \tag{4.23}$$

takes the form

$$(u^{-1})_{\underline{a}}{}^{\underline{c}} R_{\underline{c}}{}^{\underline{d}} u_{\underline{d}}{}^{\underline{b}} = d\hat{\Omega}_{\underline{a}}{}^{\underline{b}} + \hat{\Omega}_{\underline{a}}{}^{\underline{c}}\hat{\Omega}_{\underline{c}}{}^{\underline{b}}. \tag{4.24}$$

From (4.19), (4.22) and (4.24) it follows that the curvature $R_a{}^b$ of the surface $\mathcal{M}_{p+1}$ is

$$R_a{}^b \equiv d\omega_a{}^b + \omega_a{}^c\omega_c{}^b = u_a{}^{\underline{c}} R_{\underline{c}}{}^{\underline{d}} u_{\underline{d}}{}^b - \hat{\Omega}_a{}^i\hat{\Omega}_i{}^b, \tag{4.25}$$

where $i = 1, ..., D-p-1$ are the transverse indices (see eq. (4.11)) and

$$\hat{\Omega}_a{}^i = \left(\nabla u_a{}^{\underline{b}}\right) u_{\underline{b}}{}^i \equiv du_a{}^{\underline{b}} u_{\underline{b}}{}^i + u_a{}^{\underline{c}}\Omega_{\underline{c}}{}^{\underline{d}} u_{\underline{d}}{}^i, \quad \hat{\Omega}_i{}^a = -\delta_{ij}\eta^{ab}\hat{\Omega}_b{}^j. \tag{4.26}$$

Note that though only the target–space covariant derivative enters the expression (4.26) for $\hat{\Omega}_a{}^i$, it is also covariant with respect to the local $SO(1,p)$ transformations on the surface, since the term with the surface spin connection is identically zero because of the orthogonality properties of the harmonics

$$\omega_a{}^b u_b{}^{\underline{a}} u_{\underline{a}}{}^i \equiv 0.$$

In surface theory the equation (4.25), which expresses the surface curvature in terms of the target–space connection and curvature, is called the Gauss equation. The other two determining equations of surface theory contained in (4.24) are the Codazzi and Ricci equations (see [7, 6] for details). We shall present the explicit form of these equations for superembeddings in the next subsection.

Note that when the target space is flat $R_{\underline{a}}{}^{\underline{b}} = 0$ and $\Omega_{\underline{a}}{}^{\underline{b}}$ can be gauge fixed to zero, the induced spin connection $\omega_a{}^b$ on $\mathcal{M}_{p+1}$ coincides with the $SO(1,p)$ components of the Cartan form Ω_0

$$\omega_a{}^b = du_a{}^{\underline{b}} u_{\underline{b}}{}^b \tag{4.27}$$

and

$$R_{ab} = \Omega_{0a}{}^i\Omega_{0b}{}^i \quad \text{in flat} \qquad \underline{\mathcal{M}}_D.$$

Let us now derive the restriction on components of $\hat{\Omega}_a{}^i$ (4.26) which follows from the integrability condition (4.18). To this end we multiply (4.18) by $u_{\underline{b}}{}^i$, then the left hand side of (4.18) becomes zero and we get

$$e^a\hat{\Omega}_a{}^i = e^a e^b \hat{\Omega}_{b,a}{}^i = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \hat{\Omega}_{b,a}{}^i = \hat{\Omega}_{a,b}{}^i, \tag{4.28}$$

which implies that $\hat{\Omega}_{a,b}{}^i$ is symmetric in the $SO(1,p)$ indices a and b. This symmetric matrix is called the second fundamental form of the surface, and its trace $h^i = \eta^{ab}\hat{\Omega}_{a,b}{}^i$ characterizes average extrinsic curvatures of the surface in the target space [7, 6].

To summarize, the conditions (4.9) and (4.10) whose integrability leads to eqs. (4.19), (4.24) (containing (4.25)), and (4.28) completely determine the geometrical properties of embedding a general (pseudo) Riemann surface $\mathcal{M}_{p+1}$ into a (pseudo) Riemann manifold $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_D$ in terms of the vielbein, connection and curvature forms of $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_D$ pulled back on to $\mathcal{M}_{p+1}$. In other words eqs. (4.9), (4.10), (4.19) and (4.28) determine the induced geometry on the embedded surface.

From the physical point of view the induced geometry of the surface means that, though the surface is a curved manifold and hence contains a $(p+1)$–dimensional gravity, this gravity is not 'fully fledged' in the sense that the graviton on $\mathcal{M}_{p+1}$ is described by the induced metric (4.15) and, hence, is a composite field built from the worldsurface scalars $x^{\underline{m}}(\xi)$ [†].

We would like the embedded surface $\mathcal{M}_{p+1}$ to be associated with the worldvolume of a p–brane. The worldvolume which describes the classical motion of the p–brane in the target space is of a minimal volume. This is an additional condition of embedding $\mathcal{M}_{p+1}$ which is equivalent to the p–brane equations of motion.

In the geometrical language the minimal embedding of $\mathcal{M}_{p+1}$ is specified by the requirement that the trace of the second fundamental form $\hat{\Omega}_{a,b}{}^{i}$ determined in (4.26) and (4.28) is zero

$$\eta^{ab}\hat{\Omega}_{a,b}{}^{i} = 0, \tag{4.29}$$

which implies that the average extrinsic curvatures of $\mathcal{M}_{p+1}$ in $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_D$ are zero.

Let us now show that eq. (4.29) is equivalent to the p–brane equations of motion which one gets, for example, from the Nambu–Goto action (1.2). Using the definition (4.26) of $\hat{\Omega}_{a,b}{}^{i}$ and the relations (4.16), (4.2), (4.5) and (4.15) we can rewrite eq. (4.29) as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta^{ab}\hat{\Omega}_{a,b}{}^{i} &= \eta^{ab}\left(\nabla_a E^{\underline{b}}_{b}\right) u_{\underline{b}}{}^{i} = \eta^{ab}\nabla_a\left(e^m_b \partial_m x^{\underline{m}} E^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{m}}\right) E_{\underline{an}} E^{\underline{nb}} u_{\underline{b}}{}^{i} \\
&= \eta^{ab} e^n_a \partial_n\left(e^m_b \partial_m x^{\underline{m}} g_{\underline{mn}}(x)\right) E^{\underline{nb}} u_{\underline{b}}{}^{i} + \eta^{ab} e^m_a \partial_m x^{\underline{m}} g_{\underline{mn}}\left(\nabla_b E^{\underline{nb}}\right) u_{\underline{b}}{}^{i} \\
&= \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}}\partial_m\left(\sqrt{-g} g^{mn}\partial_n x^{\underline{m}} g_{\underline{mn}}(x)\right) - g^{mn}\partial_m x^{\underline{m}}\partial_n x^{\underline{l}} g_{\underline{mp}}\Gamma^{\underline{p}}_{\underline{ln}}\right] E^{\underline{nb}} u^{i}_{\underline{b}} = 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.30}$$

where $\nabla_a = e^m_a(\partial_m + \partial_m x^{\underline{m}}\Omega_{\underline{m}})$, and $\Gamma^{\underline{p}}_{\underline{ln}}(x)$ is the D-dimensional Christoffel symbol

$$\Gamma^{\underline{p}}_{\underline{ln}}(x) \equiv (\nabla_{\underline{l}} E^{\underline{p}}_{\underline{b}}) E^{\underline{b}}_{\underline{n}} = \left(\partial_{\underline{l}} E^{\underline{p}}_{\underline{b}} - \Omega_{\underline{lb}}{}^{\underline{c}} E^{\underline{p}}_{\underline{c}}\right) E^{\underline{b}}_{\underline{n}}. \tag{4.31}$$

In the square brackets of the last line of (4.30) one can recognize the standard equations of motion of a bosonic p–brane propagating in a D–dimensional target space. In (4.30) they are projected on to the $D-p-1$ directions transverse to the p–brane. This projection reflects the fact that, because of the (p+1)–dimensional worldvolume reparametrization

[†] An interpretation of General Relativity as induced gravity in the worldvolume of a brane has been discussed in [147].

invariance, among the D equations obtained from the Nambu–Goto action (1.2) only $D-p-1$ transverse equations are independent, and these are explicitly singled out by the geometrical embedding condition (4.29), (4.30), while the other $p+1$ equations ('parallel' to the brane) are identically satisfied. To see this let us in the last line of (4.30) substitute $u_{\underline{b}}{}^{i}$ with $u_{\underline{b}}{}^{c}$, which corresponds to projecting the equations of motion of $x^{\underline{m}}(\xi)$ along the brane worldvolume. Then 'moving' in the direction opposite to that which we followed developing eq. (4.30) we get

$$\left[\frac{1}{e}\partial_m\left(eg^{mn}\partial_n x^{\underline{m}} g_{\underline{mn}}(x)\right) - g^{mn}\partial_m x^{\underline{m}}\partial_n x^{\underline{l}} g_{\underline{mp}}\Gamma^{\underline{p}}_{\underline{ln}}\right] E^{\underline{nb}} u_{\underline{b}}{}^{c} =$$

$$= \eta^{ab}\left[(\nabla_a E^{\underline{a}}_{b})\, u_{\underline{a}}{}^{c} - e^{m}_{a}\omega_{mb}{}^{c}\right] = \eta^{ab}\left[(\nabla_a u_b{}^{\underline{a}})\, u_{\underline{a}}{}^{c} - e^{m}_{a}\omega_{mb}{}^{c}\right] \equiv 0,$$

which is identically zero by virtue of the embedding condition (4.19) for the $\mathcal{M}_{p+1}$ spin connection.

Thus, in the embedding approach the bosonic p–brane equations of motion are described by the minimal embedding condition (4.29) on components of the $\mathcal{M}_{p+1}$ pullback (4.22) of the target space connection form $\hat{\Omega}_{\underline{a}}{}^{\underline{b}}$.

We shall now generalize the results of this subsection to the description of superembeddings [45, 50].

4.2 Superembedding

Consider a supermanifold $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_{D,2n}$ locally parametrized by supercoordinates $Z^{\underline{M}} = (X^{\underline{m}}, \Theta^{\underline{\mu}})$ ($\underline{m} = 0, ..., D-1$; $\underline{\mu} = 1, ..., 2n$). When $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_{D,2n}$ is flat the index $\underline{\mu}$ is associated with an irreducible spinor representation of $SO(1, D-1)$ and, in addition, can also include an internal index corresponding to N-extended supersymmetry, as in the case of the $N=2$, $D=10$ superstrings (Section 3).

We assume that the supergeometry on $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_{D,2n}$ is such that it describes a D–dimensional supergravity (see Subsections 2.7 and 3.3). This implies that the structure group of the tangent superspace of $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_{D,2n}$ is $SO(1, D-1)$ (or more precisely $Spin(1, D-1)$) and the supervielbein components

$$E^{\underline{A}}(Z) = dZ^{\underline{M}} E^{\underline{A}}_{\underline{M}} = (E^{\underline{a}}, E^{\underline{\alpha}}) \tag{4.32}$$

satisfy the torsion constraint (3.79).

We are interested in embedding into the target superspace $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_{D,2n}$ a supersurface $\mathcal{M}_{p+1,n}$ locally parametrized by supercoordinates $z^M = (\xi^m, \eta^\mu)$. With such an embedding we would like to describe the dynamics of superbranes whose n-dimensional κ–symmetry is replaced by more fundamental worldvolume supersymmetry. So, we take a supersurface with the number of fermionic directions η^μ which is half the number of the target

superspace fermionic directions.[†].

We should stress that the consideration of general properties of superembeddings carried out in this subsection is schematic, as far as spinors and Γ–matrices are concerned, since it is pretty hard to describe with one and the same set of exact formulae different types of spinor representations (Majorana, Majorana–Weyl, simplectic–Majorana, etc.) which are used in each given case of superembedding depending on D and p.

A local cotangent frame on $\mathcal{M}_{p+1,n}$ is given by the supervielbein

$$e^A(z) = dz^M e_M^A = (e^a,\ e^{\alpha q}) \tag{4.33}$$

whose components are transformed under vector and spinor representations of the structure group $SO(1,p)\times SO(D-p-1)$ of $\mathcal{M}_{p+1,n}$ (remember that D is the bosonic dimension of the target superspace). The index $a = 0, 1, ..., p$ is the index of the vector representation of $SO(1,p)$, while α and q are the indices of irreducible spinor representations of $SO(1,p)$ and $SO(D-p-1)$, respectively, such that $\dim Spin(1,p) \times \dim Spin(D-p-1) = n$. These requirements on the structure group of $\mathcal{M}_{p+1,n}$ and its spinor representations put restrictions on the dimensions of supersurfaces which can be embedded into a given target superspace. The analysis of possible superembeddings of this kind shows that they correspond to all known superbranes (super–p–branes, D–branes and M–branes) and their dimensional reductions (possibly accompanied by a dualization). This results in a brane scan [50] similar to the standard one [149].

At the moment we do not make any assumption concerning the supergeometry of $\mathcal{M}_{p+1,n}$, since, as we shall see, it is determined by the superembedding condition.

Consider the pullback on to $\mathcal{M}_{p+1,n}$ of the $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_{D,2n}$ supervielbein $E^{\underline{A}}$

$$E^{\underline{a}} = e^A e_A{}^M \partial_M Z^{\underline{M}} E_{\underline{M}}^{\underline{a}} \equiv e^a E_a^{\underline{a}} + e^{\alpha q} E_{\alpha q}^{\underline{a}}, \tag{4.34}$$

$$E^{\underline{\alpha}} = e^A e_A{}^M \partial_M Z^{\underline{M}} E_{\underline{M}}^{\underline{\alpha}} \equiv e^a E_a^{\underline{\alpha}} + e^{\alpha q} E_{\alpha q}^{\underline{\alpha}}, \tag{4.35}$$

where $e_A{}^M(z)$ is the supervielbein matrix inverse to $e_M^A(z)$.

As in the bosonic case we postulate that the superembedding is such that with an appropriate choice of the local frame e^a on $\mathcal{M}_{p+1,n}$ and by the use of local $SO(1,D-1)$ rotations (4.11)–(4.13) one can direct the vector component pullback (4.34) of $E^{\underline{a}}$ on the supersurface such that

$$E^a \equiv E^{\underline{b}} u_{\underline{b}}{}^a(z) = e^a(z), \tag{4.36}$$

[†]One can study the embedding of a more general class of supersurfaces with the dimension d_f of the odd (fermionic) subspace being less than n. As we have seen with the examples of superparticles (Subsection 2.5.4) and superstrings (Subsection 3.2.1), such embeddings may also describe superbranes which preserve half of the target–space supersymmetries, but there may exist superembeddings which describe BPS states preserving a lower number of target space supersymmetries. Let us also mention that the embedding of supersurfaces with $d_f > n$, in general, seems to be too restrictive to describe physically interesting models (see, however, [148]).

$$E^i \equiv E^{\underline{b}} u_{\underline{b}}{}^i(z) = e^b E_b^{\underline{b}} u_{\underline{b}}{}^i = 0. \tag{4.37}$$

Eqs. (4.34), (4.36) and (4.37) imply that $e^a(z)$ is the induced supervielbein on $\mathcal{M}_{p+1,n}$ since it coincides with the pullback of $E^{\underline{a}}$. We also see that

$$E_a^{\underline{a}}(Z(z)) = u_a{}^{\underline{a}}(z). \tag{4.38}$$

But what is most important, in view of (4.34)–(4.37), we get the basic superembedding condition

$$E_{\alpha q}^{\underline{a}} \equiv e_{\alpha q}^M \partial_M Z^{\underline{M}} E_{\underline{M}}^{\underline{a}} = 0. \tag{4.39}$$

Thus, the superembedding condition (4.39) is a natural consequence of the embedding carried out in such a way that the bosonic *cotangent* subspace of $\mathcal{M}_{p+1,n}$ is a subspace of the bosonic *cotangent* subspace of $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_{D,2n}$. Alternatively, eq. (4.39) implies that the fermionic *tangent* subspace of $\mathcal{M}_{p+1,n}$ is a subspace of the fermionic *tangent* subspace of $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_{D,2n}$.

The embedding conditions (4.36), (4.37) and (4.39) imply that (as in the bosonic case (4.15)) the supersurface metric

$$g_{mn}(z) \equiv e_m{}^a e_n{}^b \eta_{ab} = \partial_m Z^{\underline{M}} E_{\underline{M}}^{\underline{a}} \partial_n Z^{\underline{N}} E_{\underline{N}}^{\underline{b}} \eta_{\underline{a}\underline{b}} = E_m^{\underline{a}} E_{n\underline{a}} \tag{4.40}$$

is the induced metric.

In addition to the vector components the supervielbein (4.32) contains the spinor components (4.35). When the vector components are transformed by the $SO(1, D-1)$ matrix $u_{\underline{b}}{}^{\underline{a}}$, the spinor components must be *simultaneously* transformed by a matrix $v_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\underline{\alpha}}$ of the spinor representation of $SO(1, D-1)$. The matrices $u_{\underline{b}}{}^{\underline{a}}$ and $v_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\underline{\alpha}}$ are related to each other by the standard D–dimensional Γ–matrix defining conditions

$$\Gamma_{\underline{\gamma}\underline{\delta}}^{\underline{b}} u_{\underline{b}}{}^{\underline{a}} \equiv v_{\underline{\gamma}}{}^{\underline{\alpha}} \Gamma_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}}^{\underline{a}} v_{\underline{\delta}}{}^{\underline{\beta}}. \tag{4.41}$$

Eq. (4.41) implies that $u_{\underline{b}}{}^{\underline{a}}$ are composed of $v_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\underline{\alpha}}$, which have $D(D-1)/2$ independent components corresponding to $D(D-1)/2$ independent generators of $Spin(1, D-1)$.

The choice of the Γ–matrices depends on the dimensions D and p, but for the embedding under consideration they can always be *schematically* represented by the following $SO(1,p) \times SO(D-p-1)$ invariant set of matrices (compare with eq. (2.94)). In the directions parallel to the supersurface

$$\Gamma_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}}^a = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_{\alpha\beta}^a \delta_q^r & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma^{a\alpha\beta} \delta_{q'}^{r'} \end{pmatrix}, \quad a = 0, 1, ..., p\,, \tag{4.42}$$

and in the directions normal to the supersurface

$$\Gamma_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}}^i = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \delta_\beta^\alpha \gamma_{qq'}^i \\ \delta_\alpha^\beta (\gamma^i)^{q'q} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad i = 1, ..., D-p-1\,, \tag{4.43}$$

where $\gamma^a_{\alpha\beta}$ are $d = p+1$ γ–matrices, and the matrices $\gamma^i_{qq'}$ obey the $SO(D-p-1)$ Clifford algebra, the indices q and q' corresponding to (in general non–equivalent) spinor representations of $SO(D-p-1)$. Note that in (4.42) and (4.43) the $SO(1,D-1)$ spinor indices $\underline{\alpha}$, $\underline{\beta}$ split into the $SO(1,p)\times SO(D-p-1)$ spinor indices (αq) of the $\mathcal{M}_{p+1,n}$ odd subspace and the $SO(1,p)\times SO(D-p-1)$ spinor indices $\alpha' := (\alpha q')$ 'transverse' to the supersurface.

The spinor components of the supervielbein pullback (4.35) transformed with

$$v_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\underline{\alpha}}(z) \equiv \left(v_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\alpha q},\ v_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\alpha'}\right) \tag{4.44}$$

take the form

$$E^{\underline{\beta}}v_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\underline{\alpha}} = \left(E^{\underline{\beta}}v_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\alpha q}, E^{\underline{\beta}}v_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\alpha'}\right), \quad \text{where} \quad v_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\alpha'} \equiv v_{\underline{\beta},\alpha q'}. \tag{4.45}$$

In the same way as we have done with the vector basis (4.36), we can always make a choice of a spinor basis $e^{\alpha q}$ on $\mathcal{M}_{p+1,n}$ such that

$$E^{\underline{\beta}}v_{\underline{\beta}}^{\alpha q} = e^{\alpha q}, \tag{4.46}$$

which, in view of (4.35), implies

$$E^{\underline{\beta}}_{\underline{a}}v_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\alpha q} = 0, \tag{4.47}$$

$$E^{\underline{\beta}}_{\underline{\beta r}}v_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\alpha q} = \delta_\beta{}^\alpha\delta_r{}^q, \tag{4.48}$$

and, hence,

$$E^{\underline{\beta}}v_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\alpha'} \equiv e^{\alpha q}h_{\alpha q}{}^{\alpha'} + e^a E^{\underline{\beta}}_{\underline{a}}v_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\alpha'}, \tag{4.49}$$

where

$$h_{\alpha q}{}^{\alpha'}(z) \equiv h_{\alpha q,\beta q'}(z), \tag{4.50}$$

is an $SO(1,p)\times SO(D-p-1)$–valued matrix on $\mathcal{M}_{p+1,n}$. From eqs. (4.47)–(4.50) we derive that

$$E^{\underline{\beta}}_{\underline{\alpha q}} = v_{\alpha q}{}^{\underline{\beta}} + h_{\alpha q}{}^{\alpha'}\ v_{\alpha'}{}^{\underline{\beta}}, \tag{4.51}$$

where by $v_{\alpha q}{}^{\underline{\beta}}$ and $v_{\alpha'}{}^{\underline{\alpha}}$ we have defined the components of the matrix

$$(v^{-1})_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\underline{\alpha}} \equiv \left(v_{\alpha q}{}^{\underline{\alpha}},\ v_{\alpha'}{}^{\underline{\alpha}}\right) \tag{4.52}$$

inverse to $v_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\underline{\beta}} \equiv \left(v_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\alpha q},\ v_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\alpha'}\right)$.

The inverse matrices (4.17) and (4.52) are related by the equation similar to (4.41)

$$\Gamma^{\underline{b}}_{\underline{\gamma\delta}}(u^{-1})_{\underline{b}}{}^{\underline{a}} \equiv (v^{-1})_{\underline{\gamma}}{}^{\underline{\alpha}}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{\alpha\beta}}(v^{-1})_{\underline{\delta}}{}^{\underline{\beta}}. \tag{4.53}$$

Note that the embedding conditions (4.36), (4.37), (4.46) and (4.49) are defined up to the local $SO(1,p)\times SO(D-p-1)$ rotations which reduce the number of independent components of $u_{\underline{b}}{}^{\underline{a}}(z)$ and $v_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\underline{\beta}}(z)$ from $D(D-1)/2$ down to $D(D-1)/2-(p+1)p/2-(D-p-1)(D-p-2)/2 = (p+1)(D-p-1)$. Hence, as in the bosonic case, the

matrices $u_{\underline{b}}{}^{\underline{a}}$ and $v_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\underline{\beta}}(z)$ are, respectively, Lorentz–vector and Lorentz–spinor harmonics which parametrize the coset space $\frac{SO(1,D-1)}{SO(1,p)\times SO(D-p-1)}$ [92, 93, 45].

As we shall see in Section 5 the physical meaning of the supersurface field $h_{\alpha q}{}^{\alpha'}(z)$ is that it appears in (4.49) due to the presence of gauge fields on the worldvolume of superbranes, such as Dirac–Born–Infeld vector fields of the D–branes and the self–dual antisymmetric gauge field of the M–5–brane. $h_{\alpha q}{}^{\alpha'}(z)$ is expressed in terms of the field strengths of these fields [50, 51, 197].

For the ordinary super–p–branes (where there is no worldvolume matter other than scalar and spinor fields associated with the transverse oscillations of the brane in the target superspace) $h_{\alpha q}{}^{\alpha'}(z)$ is either auxiliary (as in the case of an $N = 1$, $D = 4$ supermembrane [70]) or zero [45]. We shall demonstrate this for the $N = 1$ superparticles and superstrings in the next subsection, and for the $D = 11$ supermembrane in Subsection 5.1.

We now consider the consequences of the superembedding conditions (4.36)–(4.39), (4.46)–(4.51) for the properties of the induced supergeometry of $\mathcal{M}_{p+1,n}$. As in the bosonic case (eq. (4.18)), we take the $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_{D,2n}$ external differential $\nabla = d + \Omega$ of the vector supervielbein pullback (4.34). Then, in view of (4.38), (4.39) and the target space supergravity torsion constraint

$$T^{\underline{a}} \equiv \nabla E^{\underline{a}} = dE^{\underline{a}} + E^{\underline{b}}\Omega_{\underline{b}}{}^{\underline{a}} = -iE^{\underline{\alpha}}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}}E^{\underline{\beta}}, \tag{4.54}$$

where all other components of the two–form $T^{\underline{a}}$ are (conventionally) put to zero [†], we get

$$-iE^{\underline{\alpha}}\Gamma^{\underline{b}}_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}}E^{\underline{\beta}} = T^a u_a{}^{\underline{b}} - e^b\left(\omega_b{}^a u_a{}^{\underline{b}} - \nabla u_b{}^{\underline{b}}\right). \tag{4.55}$$

Remember that $T^a = \frac{1}{2}e^B e^A T^a_{AB} = de^a + e^b\omega_b{}^a$ is the supersurface torsion and $E_a{}^{\underline{b}} = u_a{}^{\underline{b}}$ (4.38).

From (4.55) it follows that (up to an appropriate redefinition of T^a) the $\mathcal{M}_{p+1,n}$ spin connection $\omega_b{}^a$ can always be identified with $\nabla u_b{}^{\underline{b}} u_{\underline{b}}{}^a$, as in the bosonic case (4.19)

$$\omega_b{}^a = \nabla u_b{}^{\underline{b}} u_{\underline{b}}{}^a \equiv (du_b{}^{\underline{b}} + u_b{}^{\underline{a}}\Omega_{\underline{a}}{}^{\underline{b}})u_{\underline{b}}{}^a \equiv \hat{\Omega}_b{}^a. \tag{4.56}$$

Then (4.55) reduces to

$$T^a \equiv \frac{1}{2}e^B e^A T^a_{AB} = -iE^{\underline{\alpha}}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}}E^{\underline{\beta}}u_{\underline{a}}{}^a \equiv T^{\underline{a}}u_{\underline{a}}{}^a \tag{4.57}$$

and

$$e^a\nabla E_a{}^{\underline{b}}u_{\underline{b}}{}^i = e^a\nabla u_a{}^{\underline{b}}u_{\underline{b}}{}^i \equiv e^a\hat{\Omega}_a{}^i = -iE^{\underline{\alpha}}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}}E^{\underline{\beta}}u_{\underline{a}}{}^i. \tag{4.58}$$

The equations (4.57) and (4.58) are the integrability conditions of the superembedding conditions (4.37), (4.39), (4.46) and (4.56).

[†]Provided that the basic torsion constraint $T^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}} = -2i\Gamma^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}}$ is imposed, all other torsion constraints are derived by solving for the torsion Bianchi identities. In addition, by redefining the supervielbeins and superconnection one can always put all components of $T^{\underline{a}}$ except for $T^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}}$ to zero (see [151]–[154], [128, 127, 129] for a detailed analysis of supergravity constraints in various dimensions).

In particular, eq. (4.57) implies that the superembedding conditions (4.39), (4.46) and (4.56) require the supersurface torsion to satisfy constraints, whose form depends on the concrete superembedding under consideration [45] (see Section 5).

Thus, if target space supergeometry is constrained to be of the supergravity type, the superembedding induces supergeometry on the supersurface such that it corresponds to a worldvolume (induced) supergravity. The supermultiplet of the induced supergravity includes the graviton and gravitino which are composed from components of a worldvolume matter supermultiplet. The matter supermultiplet consists of the $D-p-1$ scalar modes $x^i(\xi)$ and the $\frac{n}{2}$ spinor modes $\theta^{\alpha'}$ of the brane transverse fluctuations, and it may also contain worldvolume gauge fields (as in the case of the D–branes and the M5–brane).

Let us now briefly discuss the consequences of the integrability equation (4.58). In each given case of superembedding, eq. (4.58) allows one to find out whether or not the superembedding condition (4.39) contains the superbrane equations of motion.

From eq. (4.58), in view of (4.41), (4.43), (4.46) and (4.49), it follows that, as in the bosonic case (4.28), the vector component of the superform $\hat\Omega_a{}^i = e^A\hat\Omega_{A,a}{}^i$ is symmetric with respect to the $SO(1,p)$ vector indices

$$e^a e^b \hat\Omega_{b,a}{}^i = 0, \quad \Rightarrow \quad \hat\Omega_{b,a}{}^i = \hat\Omega_{a,b}{}^i. \tag{4.59}$$

By analogy with the bosonic embedding we can identify $\hat\Omega_{a,b}{}^i \equiv e_a{}^M \partial_M Z^{\underline{M}} \nabla_{\underline{M}} E_b^{\underline{a}} u_{\underline{a}}{}^i$ with components of the second fundamental form of the supersurface $\mathcal{M}_{p+1,n}$ defined as

$$K_{AB}{}^{C'} = e_A{}^M \left(\partial_M Z^{\underline{M}} \nabla_{\underline{M}} E_B^{\underline{A}} + \omega_{MB}{}^C E_C^{\underline{A}}\right) E_{\underline{A}}{}^{C'} \tag{4.60}$$

where

$$E_{\underline{A}}{}^{C'} \equiv (u_{\underline{a}}{}^i,\ v_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\alpha'} - v_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\alpha q} h_{\alpha q}{}^{\alpha'}), \quad E_B^{\underline{A}} E_{\underline{A}}{}^{C'} \equiv 0, \quad \alpha' = (_{\beta r'})$$

In many cases of embedding $\mathcal{M}_{p+1,n}$ into $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_{D,2n}$ the integrability conditions of (4.39) require additional restrictions on the components of $\hat\Omega_{A,a}{}^i$, such as a (possibly inhomogeneous) analog of the tracelessness of its vector part $\eta^{ab}\hat\Omega_{b,a}{}^i = 0$, which is equivalent to the bosonic field equations (4.30), and the condition on the spinor part of the following type [94, 45]

$$(\gamma^a)^{\beta\alpha}\hat\Omega_{\alpha q,a}{}^i = 0. \tag{4.61}$$

As we shall see in the next section, eq. (4.61) amounts to the fermionic field equations, and, hence, is a superembedding counterpart of the bosonic minimal embedding condition (4.29).

Therefore, when integrability requires (4.61) or its inhomogeneous generalization due to the structure of the supergravity background, the superembedding condition (4.39) (or equivalently (4.36)) contains the equations of motion of the corresponding superbrane. This is in contrast to the bosonic embedding where the minimal embedding condition (4.29), being equivalent to the dynamical equations for the bosonic brane, is always imposed as an additional condition.

Note that eq. (4.61) is a generic minimal superembedding condition, and it can be also used (as an addition condition) to find the superbrane equations of motion in the cases where the basic superembedding condition (4.39) is off–shell.

To find out whether the superembedding condition (4.39) puts a given superbrane theory on the mass shell one should examine each case separately. In the next section we shall make such an analysis for the M–theory branes.

To conclude the description of the induced supergeometry of $\mathcal{M}_{p+1,n}$ we should identify the $SO(D-p-1)$ connection $A_q{}^r = dz^M A_{Mq}{}^r(z) = \frac{1}{4}A^{ij}(\gamma_{ij})_q{}^r$ acting on the spinor components $e^{\alpha q}$ of the $\mathcal{M}_{p+1,n}$ supervielbein (4.33). Note that the $Spin(1,p)$ connection $\omega_\alpha{}^\beta(z)$ is given by the standard relation

$$\omega_\alpha{}^\beta(z) = \frac{1}{4}\omega^{ab}(\gamma_{ab})_\alpha{}^\beta = \frac{1}{4}\hat{\Omega}^{ab}(\gamma_{ab})_\alpha{}^\beta. \tag{4.62}$$

To find the form of $A_q{}^r$ let us take the $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_{D,2n}$ external differential ∇ of eq. (4.35) and multiply the result by $v_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\beta r}$. In view of eqs. (4.47)– (4.51) we get

$$\begin{aligned} T^{\underline{\alpha}}v_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\beta r} &= T^{\beta r} + e^a(\nabla E_a^{\underline{\alpha}})v_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\beta r} + e^{\alpha q}h_{\alpha q}{}^{\alpha'}(\nabla v_{\alpha'}^{\underline{\alpha}})v_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\beta r} \\ &+ e^{\alpha q}\left[(\nabla v_{\alpha q}^{\underline{\alpha}})v_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\beta r} - \delta_q{}^r\omega_\alpha{}^\beta - \delta_\alpha{}^\beta A_q{}^r\right], \end{aligned} \tag{4.63}$$

where $T^{\beta r} \equiv de^{\beta r} + e^{\alpha r}\omega_\alpha{}^\beta + e^{\beta q}A_q{}^r$ is the spinor component of the $\mathcal{M}_{p+1,n}$ torsion form.

Using the harmonic relations (4.41) and (4.53) one can show that

$$(\nabla v_{\alpha q}^{\underline{\alpha}})v_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\beta r} = \frac{1}{4}\delta_q^r\hat{\Omega}^{ab}(\gamma_{ab})_\alpha{}^\beta + \frac{1}{4}\delta_\alpha{}^\beta\hat{\Omega}^{ij}(\gamma_{ij})_q{}^r, \tag{4.64}$$

where $\hat{\Omega}^{ab}$ and $\hat{\Omega}^{ij}$ are components of the target–space connection form defined in (4.22) and (4.56).

In eqs. (4.56) and (4.62) we have identified ω^{ab} with $\hat{\Omega}^{ab}$. Then from eqs. (4.63) and (4.64) it follows that we can identify the $SO(D-p-1)$ connection form on $\mathcal{M}_{p+1,n}$ with $\hat{\Omega}^{ij}$ [†], i.e.

$$A^{ij} = \hat{\Omega}^{ij}, \quad A_q{}^r = \frac{1}{4}\hat{\Omega}^{ij}(\gamma_{ij})_q{}^r, \tag{4.65}$$

and eq. (4.63) reduces to the expression defining $T^{\beta r}$ as the induced torsion of $\mathcal{M}_{p+1,n}$

$$T^{\beta r} = T^{\underline{\alpha}}v_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\beta r} - e^a(\nabla E_a^{\underline{\alpha}})v_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\beta r} - e^{\alpha q}h_{\alpha q}{}^{\alpha'}(\nabla v_{\alpha'}^{\underline{\alpha}})v_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\beta r}. \tag{4.66}$$

The curvature forms associated with the induced connections $\omega_a{}^b$ and $A_i{}^j$ are obtained by taking the corresponding components of the pullback (4.24) of the target space curvature. $R_a{}^b$ has the form similar to the Gauss equation (4.25)

$$R_a{}^b \equiv d\omega_a{}^b + \omega_a{}^c\omega_c{}^b = u_a{}^{\underline{c}}R_{\underline{c}}{}^{\underline{d}}u_{\underline{d}}{}^b - \hat{\Omega}_a{}^i\hat{\Omega}_i{}^b, \tag{4.67}$$

[†]Our choice of the supersurface connections (4.62) and (4.65) is such that $[(d+\Omega+\omega+A)v_{\alpha q}^{\underline{\beta}}]v_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\beta r} \equiv 0$ (see also the footnote to eq. (4.19)). This differs from the choice of refs. [51, 52] where the form of the connections has been fixed in such a way that the supersurface torsion components T^c_{Ab} and $T^{\gamma s}_{\alpha q,\beta r}$ vanish.

and $R_i{}^j$ is determined by the so–called Ricci equation

$$R_i{}^j \equiv dA_i{}^j + A_i{}^k A_k{}^j = u_i{}^{\underline{c}} R_{\underline{c}}{}^{\underline{d}} u_{\underline{d}}{}^j - \hat{\Omega}_i{}^a \hat{\Omega}_a{}^j. \tag{4.68}$$

The last equation contained in (4.24) is the Codazzi equation which specifies the form of the supersurface covariant differential of $\hat{\Omega}_a{}^i$

$$\mathcal{D}\hat{\Omega}_a{}^i \equiv d\hat{\Omega}_a{}^i + \omega_a{}^b \hat{\Omega}_b{}^i + \hat{\Omega}_a{}^j A_j{}^i = u_a{}^{\underline{c}} R_{\underline{c}}{}^{\underline{d}} u_{\underline{d}}{}^i. \tag{4.69}$$

From eq. (4.69) we see that in the flat target (super)space ($R = 0$) the (super)embedding is such that the external covariant differential of $\hat{\Omega}_a{}^i$ on the (super)surface vanishes.

To summarize, the equations (4.36), (4.37), (4.46), (4.56) and (4.65)–(4.69) completely determine the induced geometrical properties of the embedded supersurface in terms of the pullbacks of the target–superspace supervielbein and superconnection adapted to the supersurface by the use of the Lorentz harmonics.

Note that, analyzing the general properties of the superembedding, we have from the beginning imposed the constraints (4.54) on target–superspace geometry, which we find more instructive. But instead of introducing the target–superspace constraints, we might from the beginning specify the supergeometry on the supersurface. Then the constraints on the geometry of target superspace would arise as consequences of the integrability of the superembedding condition.

These two initial options of choosing the superspace constraints for studying the superembeddings are equivalent, and depending on the problem considered it is convenient to use one option or another.

This equivalence follows from the general property of the basic superembedding condition (4.39). If we only impose this condition and do not assume any constraints on the supersurface and target–superspace torsion, the spinor components of the torsion T^a and the pullback of $T^{\underline{a}}$ are related by the following identity

$$T^a_{\alpha q, \beta r} E^{\underline{a}}_a = E_{\alpha q}{}^{\underline{\alpha}} E_{\beta r}{}^{\underline{\alpha}} T^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}}, \tag{4.70}$$

which can be easily derived from (4.34) by taking the covariant external differential of both of its sides and taking into account (4.39).

We shall now demonstrate how in the generic case to extract κ–symmetry transformations from general local superdiffeomorphisms of the embedded supersurface [27, 45, 72, 51, 52, 70].

4.3 κ–symmetry from the point of view of superembedding

As we have already mentioned (see eqs. (1.4), (2.26) and (3.12) as examples) for all known superbranes in the Green–Schwarz–type formulation the κ–symmetry transformations of the superbrane coordinates $Z^{\underline{M}}(\xi)$ in target superspace have the following generic form

$$\delta_\kappa Z^{\underline{M}} E^{\underline{\alpha}}_{\underline{M}} = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \bar{\Gamma})^{\underline{\alpha}}{}_{\underline{\beta}} \kappa^{\underline{\beta}}, \tag{4.71}$$

$$\delta_\kappa Z^{\underline{M}} E_{\underline{M}}^{\underline{a}} = 0, \tag{4.72}$$

where $\frac{1}{2}(1+\bar{\Gamma})^{\underline{\alpha}}_{\underline{\beta}}$ is a spinor projection matrix specific to each type of superbranes.

At the same time, in the superembedding approach $Z^{\underline{M}}(z^M)$ ($z^M = (\xi^m, \eta^\mu)$) are worldvolume superfields transformed as scalars under the $\mathcal{M}_{p+1,n}$ superdiffeomorphisms $z'^M = z'^M(z)$, their infinitesimal variations being

$$\delta Z^{\underline{M}} = \delta z^M \partial_M Z^{\underline{M}} = \delta z^M e_M^A (e_A^N \partial_N Z^{\underline{M}}). \tag{4.73}$$

Multiplying (4.73) by $E_{\underline{M}}^{\underline{A}}$ and splitting the index A on the vector and spinor indices ($\underline{a}$, $\underline{\alpha}$) we get

$$\delta Z^{\underline{M}} E_{\underline{M}}^{\underline{\alpha}} = \delta z^M e_M^A (e_A^N \partial_N Z^{\underline{M}} E_{\underline{M}}^{\underline{\alpha}}) \equiv \delta z^M e_M^A E_A^{\underline{\alpha}}, \tag{4.74}$$

$$\delta Z^{\underline{M}} E_{\underline{M}}^{\underline{a}} = \delta z^M e_M^A (e_A^N \partial_N Z^{\underline{M}} E_{\underline{M}}^{\underline{a}}) \equiv \delta z^M e_M^A E_A^{\underline{a}}. \tag{4.75}$$

Because of the superembedding condition (4.39), eq. (4.75) reduces to

$$\delta Z^{\underline{M}} E_{\underline{M}}^{\underline{a}} = \delta z^M e_M^a E_a^{\underline{a}}. \tag{4.76}$$

Comparing (4.76) with (4.72) we see that to get κ–symmetry transformations from the worldvolume superdiffeomorphisms we should consider such variations of z^M for which the Grassmann–even superdiffeomorphisms are zero

$$\delta z^M e_M^a = 0 = \delta Z^{\underline{M}} E_{\underline{M}}^{\underline{a}}. \tag{4.77}$$

Then only the Grassmann–odd part $\delta z^M e_M^{\alpha q}$ of the $\mathcal{M}_{p+1,n}$ superdiffeomorphisms contributes to the variation (4.74), and we get

$$\delta Z^{\underline{M}} E_{\underline{M}}^{\underline{\alpha}} = \delta z^M e_M^{\alpha q} E_{\alpha q}^{\underline{\alpha}}. \tag{4.78}$$

Since $\delta z^M e_M^{\alpha q}$ are arbitrary variations we can (without losing generality) replace them with

$$\delta z^M e_M^{\alpha q} \equiv \kappa^{\underline{\beta}}(z) v_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\alpha q}. \tag{4.79}$$

Eq. (4.78) takes the form

$$\delta Z^{\underline{M}} E_{\underline{M}}^{\underline{\alpha}} = \kappa^{\underline{\beta}}(z) \left(v_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\alpha q} E_{\alpha q}^{\underline{\alpha}} \right). \tag{4.80}$$

If we now recall the superembedding conditions (4.48), (4.51) ($E_{\alpha q}^{\underline{\alpha}} = v_{\alpha q}^{\underline{\alpha}} + h_{\alpha q}{}^{\alpha'} v_{\alpha'}{}^{\underline{\alpha}}$) we shall notice that $v_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\alpha q} E_{\alpha q}^{\underline{\alpha}} = P_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\underline{\alpha}}(z)$ is a projector ($P_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\underline{\gamma}} P_{\underline{\gamma}}{}^{\underline{\alpha}} = P_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\underline{\alpha}}$). This projector can be identified (possibly, up to linear transformations) with $\frac{1}{2}(1+\bar{\Gamma})$ from (4.71), i.e.

$$\frac{1}{2}(1+\bar{\Gamma})^{\underline{\alpha}}_{\underline{\beta}} = v_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\alpha q} E_{\alpha q}^{\underline{\alpha}}. \tag{4.81}$$

We conclude that the leading ($\eta^\mu = 0$) components of the infinitesimal superdiffeomorphisms (4.80) and (4.77) yield the κ–symmetry transformations (4.71) and (4.73).

Here it is also the place to note that in the superembedding formulation of the superbranes we have not introduced Wess–Zumino terms as independent objects. The reason is that in superbrane actions the Wess–Zumino term is introduced to ensure the nonmanifest κ–symmetry of the worldvolume action, while in this formulation the construction is manifestly worldvolume superdiffeomorphism invariant. In the superembedding approach the Wess–Zumino term shows up in the structure of the bosonic equations of motion, which we will see with the examples of the M–theory branes.

4.4 $N = 1$, $D = 10$ superparticles and superstrings from the general perspective of superembedding

Let us now connect the general properties of the superembeddings considered in the previous subsection with the doubly supersymmetric description of $N = 1$, $D = 10$ superparticles and superstrings given in Sections 2 and 3. Superembeddings which describe superparticles have been discussed in [150], and the $N = 1, 2$, $D = 10$ superstrings have been studied in [45].

In these cases the target superspace is $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_{10,16}$ (for simplicity, we take it to be flat), and the embedded supersurface is $\mathcal{M}_{d,8}$ (where $d = 1$ for the superparticles and $d = 2$ for the superstrings).

The target–space structure group $SO(1,9)$ is broken by the presence of the superparticle or the superstring down to $SO(1,1) \times SO(8)$. The explicit realization of the Γ–matrices (4.42) and (4.43) is given by eq. (2.94), with the matrices $C\Gamma^0$ and $C\Gamma^9$, or $C\Gamma^{\pm\pm} = C(\Gamma^0 \pm \Gamma^9)$ corresponding to the $SO(1,1)$ subgroup of $SO(1,9)$. The indices $a = (--, ++)$ and $\alpha = (-, +)$ are, the lightcone indices of the vector and the spinor representation of $SO(1,1)$, respectively. In the case of the superparticle the worldline coordinate τ is identified with the coordinate ξ^{--} of the superworldsheet $\xi^m = (\xi^{--}, \xi^{++})$. And recall that the odd coordinates η^{-q} of $\mathcal{M}_{d,8}$ are one–component worldline or worldsheet (chiral) spinors.

The $SO(1,1) \times SO(8)$ splitting of the Lorentz–harmonic matrices (4.11), (4.44) is

$$u_{\underline{b}}{}^{\underline{a}} = \left(u_{\underline{b}}{}^{--}, u_{\underline{b}}{}^{++},\ u_{\underline{b}}{}^{i} \right) \tag{4.82}$$

$$v_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\underline{\alpha}}(z) = \left(v_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{-q},\ v_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{+q'} \right). \tag{4.83}$$

The harmonics parametrize the coset space $\frac{SO(1,9)}{SO(1,1)\times SO(8)}$.

In the flat target superspace the projection (4.45) of the spinor supervielbein $\mathcal{E}^{\underline{\alpha}} = d\Theta^{\underline{\alpha}}$ is

$$d\Theta^{\underline{\beta}} v_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\underline{\alpha}} = \left(d\Theta^{\underline{\beta}} v_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{-q}, d\Theta^{\underline{\beta}} v_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{+q'} \right). \tag{4.84}$$

In (4.84) we can recognize the Lorentz–covariant version of the splitting of $D_q\Theta^{\underline{\mu}}$ discussed in eqs. (2.95)–(2.99), when we made the analysis of the superembedding condition for the $N = 1$ superparticle.

To get (2.95) from (4.84) we should simply take $v_{\underline{\beta}}^{\ \underline{\alpha}} = \delta_{\underline{\beta}}^{\ \underline{\alpha}}$ which implies $u_{\underline{b}}^{\ \underline{a}} = \delta_{\underline{b}}^{\ \underline{a}}$. This, of course, breaks both the right and the left $SO(1,9)$ group associated with the Lorentz harmonics (see eq. (4.13) and below) and, hence, breaks the manifest target–superspace covariant description of the superembedding. Then, for instance, eq. (4.48) reduces to eq. (2.99).

Furthermore, comparing (4.49) with (2.95), (2.102) and (2.103) (where $\tau \equiv --$) we find that

$$h_{-q,-q'} = \gamma^i_{qq'} \mathcal{E}^i_{--}, \tag{4.85}$$

where $\mathcal{E}^i_{--}$ are 'transverse' components of the vector supervielbein pullback $\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{--} = \partial_{--} X^{\underline{a}} - i\partial_{--}\bar{\Theta}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\Theta$ (2.103).

Now notice that by taking $u_{\underline{b}}^{\ \underline{a}} = \delta_{\underline{b}}^{\ \underline{a}}$ (and $v_{\underline{\beta}}^{\ \underline{\alpha}} = \delta_{\underline{\beta}}^{\ \underline{\alpha}}$) we do not (in general) have the embedding condition (4.37) (i.e. $\mathcal{E}^i_{--} \neq 0$) for an adapted local frame such that

$$\mathcal{E}^{\underline{b}}_{--} u_{\underline{b}}^{\ i} = 0. \tag{4.86}$$

To get (4.86) we must perform an appropriate $SO(1,9)$ transformation of $\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{--}$, as has been explained in the previous subsections. Once this has been done, the tensor $h_{-q,-q'}$ (4.85) vanishes.

Thus, in the case of the $N = 1$ superparticles and superstrings, when the pullback of the target–space supervielbein $E^{\underline{A}}$ is adapted (by the Lorentz harmonics) to the superworldline or the superworldsheet such that eqs. (4.36), (4.37) and (4.46) are satisfied, the h–component of $E^{\underline{\beta}}_{-q}$ is zero and (in the flat target superspace) we have

$$\mathcal{E}^{\underline{\beta}}_{-q} \equiv D_{-q}\Theta^{\underline{\beta}} = v_{-q}^{\ \underline{\beta}}. \tag{4.87}$$

From (4.87) it follows that its leading ($\eta^{-q} = 0$) component, which is the commuting spinor variable $\lambda^{\underline{\beta}}_{-q}$, coincides with components of the inverse Lorentz–spinor harmonics

$$\lambda^{\underline{\beta}}_{-q}(\xi) = v_{-q}^{\ \underline{\beta}}|_{\eta=0}. \tag{4.88}$$

And from (4.38) it follows that

$$\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{--} \equiv \partial_{--} X^{\underline{a}} - i\partial_{--}\bar{\Theta}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\Theta = u_{--}^{\ \underline{a}} \tag{4.89}$$

coincides with a light–like component of the inverse Lorentz–vector harmonics.

Using the defining harmonic relations (4.53) one can convince oneself that $\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{--}$ and $\mathcal{E}^{\underline{\beta}}_{-q}$ are related by the Cartan–Penrose formula (2.87)

$$\delta_{qr} u_{--}^{\ \underline{a}} = v_{-q} C \Gamma^{\underline{a}} v_{-r}.$$

In the Subsection 2.5.4 we have demonstrated that in $D = 10$ the independent components of the matrix $\mathcal{E}^{\underline{\beta}}_{-q}$ parametrize the S^8 sphere, while from eq. (4.87) we see that $\mathcal{E}^{\underline{\beta}}_{-q}$ coincides with components of Lorentz harmonics $v_{-q}^{\ \underline{\beta}}$ (which are new auxiliary variables

introduced in the superembedding formulation). As we have mentioned, the harmonics $(v^{-1})_{\underline{\alpha}}^{\ \underline{\beta}} = (v_{-\underline{q}}^{\ \underline{\beta}}, v_{+\underline{q}'}^{\ \underline{\beta}})$ parametrize larger (16–dimensional) coset space $\frac{SO(1,9)}{SO(1,1)\times SO(8)}$. Therefore, there should be an additional local symmetry which allows one to reduce the number of independent components in $(v^{-1})_{\underline{\alpha}}^{\ \underline{\beta}}$ from 16 to 8.

This symmetry indeed occurs since half of the harmonics, namely $v_{+\underline{q}'}^{\ \underline{\beta}}$, do not enter the relations defining the pullback of the target–space supervielbein (4.87), (4.89). Hence, we can vary the form of $v_{+\underline{q}'}^{\ \underline{\beta}}$ in a way which keeps the harmonic condition (4.53) intact. The allowed variations have the form of boost transformations K_i

$$\delta v_{-\underline{q}}^{\ \underline{\beta}} = 0, \quad \delta v_{+\underline{q}'}^{\ \underline{\beta}} = K_{++}^i(z)\gamma_{\underline{q}\underline{q}'}^i v_{-\underline{q}}^{\ \underline{\beta}}, \tag{4.90}$$

$$\delta u_{--}^{\ \underline{a}} = 0, \quad \delta u_{++}^{\ \underline{a}} = K_{++}^i u_i^{\ \underline{a}}, \quad \delta u_i^{\ \underline{a}} = \frac{1}{2} K_{++i} u_{--}^{\ \underline{a}},$$

where $K_{++}^i(z)$ are eight independent parameters.

Therefore, we see, from a somewhat different point of view, that in the case of the $N = 1$, $D = 10$ superparticles and superstrings the commuting (harmonic or twistor–like) spinor variables parametrize the compact manifold S^8–sphere, which is realized as a coset space [92, 40]

$$S^8 = \frac{SO(1,9)}{[SO(1,1) \times SO(8)] \otimes_S K_i},$$

where the stability subgroup is the semidirect product of $SO(1,1) \times SO(8)$ with the boost transformations K_i (4.90).

We conclude that the doubly supersymmetric formulation of $N = 1$ superparticles and superstrings, which we have developed in Sections 2 and 3 on dynamical grounds, completely fits into the general geometrical picture of superembeddings.

Let us now apply the general properties of superembedding to the description of M–branes.

5 M–theory branes

M–theory [16] is a $D = 11$ theory whose low energy limit is $D = 11$ supergravity [155] and which also contains supermembranes [9, 156] and super–5–branes [10] as part of its nonperturbative spectrum.

The $D = 11$ supergravity multiplet consists of the graviton $e_{\underline{m}}^{\underline{a}}(x)$, the gravitino $\psi_{\underline{m}}^{\underline{\alpha}}(x)$ and the antisymmetric 3–rank gauge field $A_{\underline{lmn}}(x)$, which are leading components of the supervielbein $E^{\underline{a}}(X, \Theta)$, $E^{\underline{\alpha}}(X, \Theta)$ and the three–form $A^{(3)}(X, \Theta)$, respectively ($\underline{a} = 0, 1..., 10$; $\underline{\alpha} = 1, ..., 32$).

The supermembrane minimally couples to the gauge field $A^{(3)}$, as superstrings minimally couple to the Neveu–Schwarz field $B^{(2)}$ (3.10). The Green–Schwarz–type supermembrane action is [9]

$$S_{M2} = -\int d^3\xi \sqrt{-\det g_{mn}} + \int_{\mathcal{M}_3} dZ^{\underline{L}} dZ^{\underline{M}} dZ^{\underline{N}} A_{\underline{NML}}(Z) \tag{5.1}$$

($g_{mn}(\xi) = E_m^{\underline{a}} E_{n\underline{a}}$, and the tension is put equal to one).

The super–5–brane minimally couples to a six–form gauge field $A^{(6)}$ whose seven–form field strength $F^{(7)} = dA^{(6)} - A^{(3)}dA^{(3)}$ is dual to the four–form field strength $F^{(4)} = dA^{(3)}$ of $A^{(3)}$. The 5–brane also (nonminimally) couples to $A^{(3)}$ via the extended self–dual field strength

$$H^{(3)}(\xi) = db^{(2)} - A^{(3)}(Z(\xi)) \tag{5.2}$$

of an antisymmetric field $b_{mn}(\xi)$ living in the worldvolume of the 5–brane [157]. In this sense the 5–brane is a dyonic object. The form of the 5–brane supergravity coupling is uniquely defined by local symmetries of the 5–brane worldvolume action which are responsible for the self–duality properties of $b_{mn}(\xi)$ [158]. The 'Born–Infeld–like' super–5–brane action is [63, 64]

$$\begin{aligned} S_{M5} &= \int d^6\xi(-\sqrt{-\det(g_{mn} + H^*_{mn})} + \frac{\sqrt{-g}}{4} H^{*mn} H_{mn}) \\ &+ \int_{\mathcal{M}_6} (A^{(6)} - \frac{1}{2} db^{(2)} \wedge A^{(3)}), \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

where $g_{mn}(\xi) = E_m^{\underline{a}} E_{n\underline{a}}$, $H_{mn} \equiv H_{mnl} v^l(\xi)$, $H^{*mn} \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}} \epsilon^{mnll_1l_2l_3} v_l H_{l_1l_2l_3}$ and $v_l(\xi) = \frac{\partial_l a(\xi)}{\sqrt{-(\partial a)^2}}$ is the normalized derivative of the auxiliary scalar field $a(\xi)$ which ensures the covariance of the 5–brane action, its construction being based on a generic method for the covariant Lagrangian description of duality–symmetric fields proposed in [159, 160].

A duality–symmetric component action for $D = 11$ supergravity, which includes both gauge fields, $A^{(3)}$ and its dual $A^{(6)}$, and which thus couples to both the membrane and the 5–brane, was constructed in [161]. This action reduces to the Cremmer–Julia–Scherk action [155] when the field $A^{(6)}$ is eliminated by solving for an algebraic part of the duality relations between $F^{(7)}$ and $F^{(4)}$.

The κ–symmetry of the supermembrane and the super–5–brane worldvolume actions requires the superbranes to propagate in target–superspace backgrounds whose supergeometry is constrained to be that of $D = 11$ supergravity.

In the case of the superspace description of $D = 11$ supergravity the constraints imposed on components of the torsion $T^{\underline{A}}(Z) = \nabla E^{\underline{A}} = dE^{\underline{A}} + E^{\underline{B}} \Omega_{\underline{B}}^{\ \underline{A}}$, curvature $R(Z)_{\underline{A}}^{\ \underline{B}} = d\Omega_{\underline{A}}^{\ \underline{B}} + \Omega_{\underline{A}}^{\ \underline{C}} \Omega_{\underline{C}}^{\ \underline{B}}$, and on the dual field strengths $F^{(4)}(Z)$ and $F^{(7)}(Z)$ have the following form [127, 129]

$$T^{\underline{a}} = -i\bar{E}\Gamma^{\underline{a}} E, \tag{5.4}$$

$$T^{\underline{\alpha}} = \frac{1}{288} F_{\underline{b}_1 \dots \underline{b}_4} E^{\underline{a}} \left(\Gamma_{\underline{a}}^{\ \underline{b}_1 \dots \underline{b}_4} - 8\delta_{\underline{a}}^{[\underline{b}_1} \Gamma^{\underline{b}_2 \dots \underline{b}_4]} \right)_{\underline{\beta}}^{\underline{\alpha}} E^{\underline{\beta}}, \tag{5.5}$$

$$R^{\underline{ab}} = -\frac{i}{144} \bar{E} \left(\Gamma^{\underline{ab}}_{\underline{c}_1 \dots \underline{c}_4} + 24 \Gamma_{[\underline{c}_1\underline{c}_2} \delta^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{c}_3} \delta^{\underline{b}}_{\underline{c}_4]} \right) E F^{\underline{c}_1 \dots \underline{c}_4} + \frac{1}{2} E^{\underline{d}} E^{\underline{c}} R_{\underline{cd}}^{\ \ \underline{ab}}, \tag{5.6}$$

$$F^{(4)} = dA^{(3)} = \frac{i}{2} E^{\underline{a}} E^{\underline{b}} \bar{E} \Gamma_{\underline{ba}} E + \frac{1}{4!} E^{\underline{a}_4} \dots E^{\underline{a}_1} F_{\underline{a}_1 \dots \underline{a}_4}, \tag{5.7}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
F^{(7)} &= dA^{(6)} - \frac{1}{2}A^{(3)}dA^{(3)} \\
&= \frac{i}{5!}E^{\underline{a}_1}...E^{\underline{a}_5}\bar{E}\Gamma_{\underline{a}_5...\underline{a}_1}E + \frac{1}{7!}E^{\underline{a}_7}...E^{\underline{a}_1}F_{\underline{a}_1...\underline{a}_7},
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.8}
$$

where the field strength components $F_{\underline{a}_1...\underline{a}_4}$ and $F_{\underline{a}_1...\underline{a}_7}$ are related by the Hodge duality

$$
F_{\underline{a}_1...\underline{a}_7} = \frac{1}{4!}\epsilon_{\underline{a}_1...\underline{a}_7\underline{b}_1...\underline{b}_4}F^{\underline{b}_1...\underline{b}_4}. \tag{5.9}
$$

The constraints (5.4)–(5.9) are *on–shell* $D = 11$ supergravity constraints since they imply the $D = 11$ supergravity equations of motion (which can be alternatively obtained from the $D = 11$ supergravity component actions [155, 161]).

Note that in $D = 11$ we deal with 32–component Majorana spinors $\bar{\Psi}_{\underline{\alpha}} = (\Psi^T)^{\underline{\beta}}C_{\underline{\beta}\underline{\alpha}}$ where C is the charge conjugation matrix, and we can use $C_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}}$ and its inverse $(C^{-1})^{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}} = -C^{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}} = -C_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}}$ to lower and raise the spinor indices. Then the following antisymmetric products of the Γ–matrices

$$
\Gamma^{\underline{a}}_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}} \equiv C_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\gamma}}(\Gamma^{\underline{a}})^{\underline{\gamma}}_{\underline{\beta}}, \quad (C\Gamma^{\underline{a}_1\underline{a}_2})_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}}, \quad (C\Gamma^{\underline{a}_1...\underline{a}_5})_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}} \tag{5.10}
$$

are symmetric in the spinor indices.

We are now in a position to describe the M-branes by applying the superembedding methods of Section 4.

5.1 The supermembrane

The superembedding of the $D = 11$ supermembrane was first analyzed in [45].

The target superspace $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_{11,32}$ is that of $D = 11$ supergravity and the embedded supersurface $\mathcal{M}_{3,16}$, associated with the supermembrane worldvolume, is characterized by a local supervielbein basis $e^A(z) = (e^a,\ e^{\alpha q})$ $(a = 0, 1, 2; \alpha = 1, 2; q = 1, ..., 8)$ transformed under the action of $SO(1, 2) \times SO(8)$. The $d = 3$ spinors are two–component Majorana spinors.

An appropriate form of the $D = 11$ Γ–matrices (4.42), (4.43), which reflects the embedding, and of the charge conjugate matrix $C^{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}}$ to raise indices, is

$$
\Gamma^a_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}} = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma^a_{\alpha\beta}\delta_{qr} & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma^{a\alpha\beta}\delta_{q'r'} \end{pmatrix}, \quad a = 0, 1, 2\,, \tag{5.11}
$$

$$
\Gamma^i_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \delta^\alpha_\beta\gamma^i_{qq'} \\ \delta^\beta_\alpha\tilde{\gamma}^i_{q'q} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad i = 1, ..., 8\,, \tag{5.12}
$$

$$
C^{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}} = \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon^{\alpha\beta}\delta_{qr} & 0 \\ 0 & -\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}\delta_{q'r'} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5.13}
$$

where $\tilde{\gamma}^i_{q'q} \equiv \gamma^i_{qq'}$ are the $SO(8)$ Γ–matrices, $\gamma^a_{\alpha\beta} \equiv \epsilon_{\alpha\gamma}\gamma^{a\gamma}{}_\beta$ are symmetric, and the $d = 3$ Γ–matrices $\gamma^{a\gamma}{}_\beta$ were defined in eq. (2.49). The $d = 3$ spinor indices are raised

and lowered by the unit antisymmetric matrices $\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}$ and $\epsilon^{\alpha\beta}$, and the $SO(8)$ indices are raised and lowered by the unit matrices δ_{qr}, $\delta_{q'r'}$, so that there is no distinction between the upper and lower $SO(8)$ indices. (Recall that the unprimed index q and the primed index q' correspond to different spinor representations of $SO(8)$).

Induced supergeometry on $\mathcal{M}_{3,16}$ is described by the general superembedding conditions (4.36)–(4.39), (4.46)– (4.51), (4.56)–(4.59) and (4.65).

We shall now analyze whether in the case under consideration their integrability puts additional restrictions on the form of the supervielbein pullback (4.49) and on components of the one–form $\hat{\Omega}_a{}^i = e^A\hat{\Omega}_{A,a}{}^i$ in (4.58). Remember that $\hat{\Omega}_{A,a}{}^i$ is related to the second fundamental form (4.28), (4.60) of the (super)surface, and if its components satisfy additional conditions, such as eqs. (4.29) and (4.61), these reproduce (super)brane equations of motion, as eq. (4.30) in the bosonic case.

Consider in more detail the equation (4.58). Making use of the harmonic relations (4.41), the form of the $D = 11$ Γ–matrices (5.11), (5.12), and the equations (4.46), (4.49), we can rewrite eq. (4.58) in the following form

$$\begin{aligned} e^a\hat{\Omega}_a{}^i &= e^a\nabla E_a{}^{\underline{b}}u_{\underline{b}}{}^i = e^a(dE_a{}^{\underline{b}} + E_a{}^{\underline{c}}\Omega_{\underline{c}}{}^{\underline{b}})u_{\underline{b}}{}^i \\ &= -2ie^{\alpha r}e^{\beta q}\gamma^i_{qq'}h_{\alpha r,\beta}{}^{q'} + 2ie^a e^{\alpha q}\gamma^i_{qq'}E^{\beta}_{\underline{a}}v_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\beta q'}\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

(Recall that $E_a{}^{\underline{b}} = u_a{}^{\underline{b}}$, see eq. (4.38)).

Comparing the left– and right–hand sides of (5.14) we find that

$$e^a e^b\hat{\Omega}_{b,a}{}^i = 0 \quad \rightarrow \quad \hat{\Omega}_{b,a}{}^i = \hat{\Omega}_{a,b}{}^i = \nabla_b E_a{}^{\underline{b}}u_{\underline{b}}{}^i, \tag{5.15}$$

$$\hat{\Omega}_{\alpha q,a}{}^i = \nabla_{\alpha q}E_a{}^{\underline{b}}u_{\underline{b}}{}^i = 2i\gamma^i_{qq'}E^{\beta}_{\underline{a}}v_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\beta q'}\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}, \tag{5.16}$$

and

$$\gamma^i_{qq'}h_{\alpha r,\beta}{}^{q'} = -\gamma^i_{rq'}h_{\beta q,\alpha}{}^{q'}. \tag{5.17}$$

Let us analyze eq. (5.17). It implies that the matrix $\gamma^i_{qq'}h_{\alpha r,\beta}{}^{q'}$ is antisymmetric with respect to the pair of the indices (αr) and (βq).

A general matrix $h_{\alpha r,\beta q'}$ is decomposed in the basis of the elements of the $SO(8)$ and $SO(1,2)$ Clifford algebras as follows

$$h_{\alpha r,\beta q'} = \epsilon_{\alpha\beta}(h_j\tilde{\gamma}^i_{q'r} + h_{j_1j_2j_3}\gamma^{j_1j_2j_3}_{q'r}) + \gamma^a_{\alpha\beta}(h_{aj}\tilde{\gamma}^j_{q'r} + h_{aj_1j_2j_3}\gamma^{j_1j_2j_3}_{q'r}), \tag{5.18}$$

where $\gamma^{j_1j_2j_3}_{q'r}$ denotes the antisymmetric product of the $SO(8)$ Γ–matrices $\tilde{\gamma}^{[j_1}_{q'q}\gamma^{j_2}_{qr'}\tilde{\gamma}^{j_3]}_{r'r}$.

Substituting (5.18) into (5.17) we get

$$\gamma^i_{qq'}(h_j\tilde{\gamma}^j_{q'r} + h_{j_1j_2j_3}\gamma^{j_1j_2j_3}_{q'r}) - (q \leftrightarrow r) = 0, \tag{5.19}$$

and

$$\gamma^i_{qq'}(h_{aj}\tilde{\gamma}^j_{q'r} + h_{aj_1j_2j_3}\gamma^{j_1j_2j_3}_{q'r}) + (q \leftrightarrow r) = 0. \tag{5.20}$$

Using the defining properties of the matrices $\gamma^i_{qq'}$ and $\tilde{\gamma}^i_{q'q} \equiv \gamma^i_{qq'}$

$$\gamma^i_{qq'}\tilde{\gamma}^j_{q'r} + \gamma^j_{qq'}\tilde{\gamma}^i_{q'r} = 2\delta_{qr},$$

we find that eqs. (5.19) and (5.20) imply that all components of the matrix (5.18) vanish

$$h_{\alpha r,\beta q'} = 0. \tag{5.21}$$

Hence, in the case of the supermembrane eq. (4.51) for the spinor components $E^{\underline{\beta}}_{\alpha q}$ of the $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_{11,32}$ supervielbein pullback reduces to

$$E^{\underline{\beta}}_{\alpha q} \equiv e^M_{\alpha q}\partial_M Z^{\underline{M}} E^{\underline{\beta}}_{\underline{M}} = v_{\alpha q}{}^{\underline{\beta}}(z). \tag{5.22}$$

This, in particular, means that the induced superworldvolume torsion (4.57) obeys the standard $d = 3$, $n = 8$ supergravity constraint

$$T^a_{\alpha q,\beta r} = -2i\delta_{qr}\gamma^a_{\alpha\beta}, \tag{5.23}$$

which follows from (4.57), (4.41), (5.11) and (5.22).

The vanishing of the h–matrix (5.21) also implies that, in view of the $D = 11$ supergravity torsion constraint (5.5), the purely spinor components of the superworldvolume torsion $T^{\alpha q}$ defined in (4.66) are zero

$$T^{\alpha q}_{\beta r,\gamma s} = 0. \tag{5.24}$$

In turn, the torsion constraints (5.23) and (5.24) imply that the covariant spinor derivatives $\mathcal{D}_A \equiv e^M_A\partial_M + \omega_A + A_A$ of the superworldvolume satisfy the algebra

$$\{\mathcal{D}_{\alpha q}, \mathcal{D}_{\beta r}\} = 2i\delta_{qr}\gamma^a_{\alpha\beta}\mathcal{D}_a + R_{\alpha q\beta r}(z), \tag{5.25}$$

where $R_{\alpha q\beta r,A}{}^B(z)$ are components of the superworldvolume curvature (4.67), (4.68).

5.1.1 The fermionic equation

Applying the covariant derivative $\mathcal{D}_{\beta r}$ to eq. (5.22), symmetrizing the result with respect to βr and αq, and making use of the basic superembedding condition (4.39), the torsion constraint $T^{\underline{\beta}}_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\gamma}} = 0$ (5.5) and the superalgebra (5.25) we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}_{\beta r}E^{\underline{\beta}}_{\alpha q} + \mathcal{D}_{\alpha q}E^{\underline{\beta}}_{\beta r} &= 2i\delta_{qr}\gamma^a_{\alpha\beta}E^{\underline{\beta}}_{\underline{a}} - v_{\alpha q}{}^{\underline{\gamma}}\Omega_{\beta r\underline{\gamma}}{}^{\underline{\beta}} - v_{\beta r}{}^{\underline{\gamma}}\Omega_{\alpha q\underline{\gamma}}{}^{\underline{\beta}} \\ &= \mathcal{D}_{\beta r}v_{\alpha q}{}^{\underline{\beta}} + \mathcal{D}_{\alpha q}v_{\beta r}{}^{\underline{\beta}}.\end{aligned} \tag{5.26}$$

Then multiplying eq. (5.26) by $v_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\gamma q'}$ and using the orthogonality properties of the spinor harmonics we obtain

$$2i\delta_{qr}\gamma^a_{\alpha\beta}E^{\underline{\beta}}_{\underline{a}}v_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\gamma q'} = (\nabla_{\beta r}v_{\alpha q}{}^{\underline{\beta}})v_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\gamma q'} \ + \ (\alpha q \ \leftrightarrow \ \beta r). \tag{5.27}$$

(Remember that $\nabla_{\beta r}$ is the spinor component of the pullback of the external target–space differential $\nabla = d + \Omega$ and $\Omega_{\underline{\alpha}}^{\ \underline{\beta}} = \frac{1}{4}\Omega^{\underline{ab}}(\Gamma_{\underline{ab}})_{\underline{\alpha}}^{\ \underline{\beta}}$).

Making use of the harmonic relations (4.41), (4.53) and the representation (5.11), (5.12) of the Γ–matrices, one can show that

$$(\nabla_{\beta r} v_{\alpha\overline{q}}^{\ \underline{\beta}}) v_{\underline{\beta}}^{\ \gamma q'} = \frac{1}{4}(\nabla_{\beta r} u_a^{\ \underline{a}}) u_{\underline{a}}^{\ i} (\gamma^a)_\alpha^{\ \gamma} (\gamma_i)_q^{\ q'} \equiv \frac{1}{4}\hat{\Omega}_{\beta r,a}^{\ \ i} (\gamma^a)_\alpha^{\ \gamma} (\gamma_i)_q^{\ q'}. \tag{5.28}$$

Substituting (5.28) into (5.27) and taking the trace of its left and right hand side with respect to the indices (q, r) and $\binom{\gamma}{\beta}$ we get

$$16 i \gamma^a_{\alpha\beta} E_{\overline{a}}^{\ \beta} v_{\underline{\beta}}^{\ \beta q'} = \frac{1}{4}\hat{\Omega}_{\beta r,a}^{\ \ i} (\gamma^a)_\alpha^{\ \beta} (\gamma_i)^{rq'}. \tag{5.29}$$

On the other hand, let us take the earlier found relation (5.16) and multiply it by $(\gamma^a)_\alpha^{\ \beta}$ and $\gamma_i^{\ q'r}$, the result is

$$16 i \gamma^a_{\alpha\beta} E_{\overline{a}}^{\ \beta} v_{\underline{\beta}}^{\ \beta q'} = -\hat{\Omega}_{\beta r,a}^{\ \ i} (\gamma^a)_\alpha^{\ \beta} \gamma_i^{\ rq'}. \tag{5.30}$$

Comparing (5.30) with (5.29) we see that their right hand sides have different coefficients and, hence, are zero. We thus get the additional restriction on components $\hat{\Omega}_{\beta r,a}^{\ \ i}$ of the second fundamental form (4.60)

$$\hat{\Omega}_{\beta r,a}^{\ \ i} (\gamma^a)^{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_i)^{rq'} = (\gamma^a)^\alpha_{\ \beta} E_{\overline{a}}^{\ \beta} v_{\underline{\beta}}^{\ \beta q'} = 0, \tag{5.31}$$

or, in view of (5.16),

$$\hat{\Omega}_{\beta r,a}^{\ \ i} (\gamma^a)^{\alpha\beta} = \nabla_{\beta r} E_{\overline{a}}^{\ \underline{b}} u_{\underline{b}}^{\ i} (\gamma^a)^{\alpha\beta} = 0. \tag{5.32}$$

Eq. (5.31) is nothing but the **16**–component Dirac–type fermionic equation of motion of the $D = 11$ supermembrane [9] written in the Lorentz–harmonic form [133] and promoted to the worldvolume superspace [45]. To see this let us rewrite (5.31) in a form similar to the fermionic equation which one derives from the supermembrane action (5.1). First of all notice that, with the use of the harmonic relations (4.53), the form of the Γ–matrices (5.11), and the embedding conditions $E_{\overline{a}}^{\ \beta} v_{\underline{\beta}}^{\ \alpha q} = 0$ (4.47) and $E_{\overline{a}}^{\ \underline{a}} = u_a^{\ \underline{a}}$ (4.38), eq. (5.31) can be presented in the following form

$$(\gamma^a)_\alpha^{\ \beta} E_{\overline{a}}^{\ \beta} v_{\underline{\beta},\beta q'} = E_{\overline{a}}^{\ \beta} (\eta^{ab} E_{\overline{b}}^{\ \underline{a}} \Gamma_{\underline{a}})_{\underline{\beta\gamma}} v_{\alpha q'}^{\ \ \gamma} = 0 \tag{5.33}$$

Multiplying eq. (5.33) by $v_{\underline{\alpha}}^{\ \alpha q'}$ we get

$$E_{\overline{a}}^{\ \beta} (\eta^{ab} E_{\overline{b}}^{\ \underline{a}} \Gamma_{\underline{a}})_{\underline{\beta\gamma}} v_{\alpha q'}^{\ \ \gamma} v_{\underline{\alpha}}^{\ \alpha q'} \equiv \frac{1}{2}\eta^{ab} E_{\overline{a}}^{\ \beta} \left[E_{\overline{b}}^{\ \underline{a}} \Gamma_{\underline{a}} (1 - \bar{\Gamma}) \right]_{\underline{\beta\alpha}} = 0 \tag{5.34}$$

where, because of the projector

$$\frac{1}{2}(1 - \bar{\Gamma})_{\underline{\alpha}}^{\ \gamma} \equiv v_{\underline{\alpha}}^{\ \alpha q'} v_{\alpha q'}^{\ \ \gamma},$$

the l.h.s. of (5.34) identically vanishes under the action of the projector

$$\frac{1}{2}(1+\bar{\Gamma})^{\underline{\alpha}}_{\underline{\beta}} \equiv v_{\underline{\beta}}^{\ \alpha q} v_{\alpha q}^{\ \underline{\alpha}} \tag{5.35}$$

in which one can recognize the κ–symmetry projector of eq. (4.80). Thus κ–symmetry insures that among the **32** equations in (5.34), only **16** are independent. And these **16** equations reduce the number of the fermionic physical modes of the supermembrane down to **8**.

Using the eqs. (4.38), (4.41), (4.53), (5.11) and (5.12) it is not hard to verify that the matrix $\bar{\Gamma}$ defined in (5.35) has exactly the same form as in the κ–symmetry projector and in the equations of motion of the Green–Schwarz formulation of the supermembrane [9]

$$\bar{\Gamma} = \frac{1}{3!}\epsilon^{abc}\Gamma_{abc}, \quad \text{where} \quad \Gamma_a = E_a^{\underline{a}}\Gamma_{\underline{a}} \tag{5.36}$$

(Note that the Lorentz harmonics have disappeared from eq. (5.36).) Thus, at ($\eta^\mu = 0$) the worldvolume superfield equation (5.34) (which is the consequence of (5.31)) reduces to the standard fermionic component equations of the supermembrane. To show this one should choose the Wess–Zumino gauge (see, for instance, [123]) for the components of the inverse supervielbein $e_A^{\ M}(z)|_{\eta=0}$ on the supersurface such that

$$e_A^{\ M}(z)|_{\eta=0} = \begin{pmatrix} e_a^{\ m}(\xi) & -\psi_a^{\mu r}(\xi) \\ 0 & \delta_\alpha^{\ \mu}\delta_q^{\ r} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{5.37}$$

and take into account the superembedding conditions $E_{\alpha q}^{\underline{a}} = 0$ (4.39) and $E_{\alpha q}^{\underline{\alpha}} = v_{\alpha q}^{\ \underline{\alpha}}$ (5.22). Then,

$$E_a^{\underline{a}}|_{\eta=0} = e_a^m(\xi)\partial_m Z^{\underline{M}} E_{\underline{M}}^{\underline{a}}|_{\eta=0} \equiv e_a^m(\xi) E_m^{\underline{a}}(Z(\xi)), \tag{5.38}$$

$$E_a^{\underline{\alpha}} v_{\underline{\alpha},\beta q'}|_{\eta=0} = e_a^m(\xi)\partial_m Z^{\underline{M}} E_{\underline{M}}^{\underline{\alpha}} v_{\underline{\alpha},\beta q'}|_{\eta=0} \equiv e_a^m(\xi) E_m^{\underline{\alpha}}(Z(\xi)) v_{\underline{\alpha},\beta q'}(\xi). \tag{5.39}$$

And the worldvolume gravitino field $\psi_a^{\mu q}(\xi)$ (5.37) is express in terms of $E_m^{\underline{\alpha}}(Z(\xi))$

$$\psi_a^{\mu q}(\xi) = e(\xi)_a^{\ m} E_m^{\underline{\alpha}} v_{\underline{\alpha}}^{\ \mu q}(\xi), \tag{5.40}$$

due to the superembedding condition (4.47).

Then the component equation of motion for $\theta^{\underline{\mu}}(\xi)$ takes the form

$$g^{mn} E_m^\beta \left[E_n^{\underline{a}}\Gamma_{\underline{a}}(1-\bar{\Gamma})\right]_{\underline{\beta\alpha}} = 0, \quad g_{mn}(\xi) = e_m^a e_{na}(\xi) = E_m^{\underline{a}} E_n^{\underline{b}} \eta_{\underline{ab}}. \tag{5.41}$$

5.1.2 The bosonic equation

Once the supermembrane fermionic equations are implied by superembedding, we can expect that (because of supersymmetry) also the bosonic equations should appear. As we have shown, the bosonic field equations (4.30) of a bosonic brane are encoded in the minimal embedding condition (4.29). We shall now find an inhomogeneous generalization

of the minimal embedding condition, the inhomogeneity reflecting the interaction of the supermembrane with the supergravity gauge field $A^{(3)}(Z)$.

It is a simple exercise to show that the bosonic field equations must hold provided that the fermionic equations (5.31) hold. This can be verified in different ways, one of which is to analyze the pullback components $T^{\underline{\alpha}}_{\underline{a},\alpha q} v_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\beta r'}$ of the torsion constraint (5.5). We, however, find it here simpler to look at the $e^{\alpha q} e^{\beta r}$ components of the Codazzi equation (4.69)

$$- 2i\delta_{qr}\gamma^b_{\alpha\beta}\hat{\Omega}_{b,a}{}^i - \mathcal{D}_{\alpha q}\hat{\Omega}_{\beta r,a}{}^i - \mathcal{D}_{\beta r}\hat{\Omega}_{\alpha q,a}{}^i = R_{\alpha q\beta r,a}{}^i. \tag{5.42}$$

Multiplying (5.42) by $\gamma^{a\alpha\beta}$ and δ^{qr}, and taking into account the fermionic equation (5.31) we get

$$\eta^{ab}\hat{\Omega}_{b,a}{}^i \equiv \eta^{ab}(\nabla_a E^{\underline{a}}_b) u_{\underline{a}}{}^i = -\frac{i}{32}\gamma^{a\alpha\beta}\delta^{qr} R_{\alpha q\beta r,a}{}^i. \tag{5.43}$$

We observe that, in comparison with the bosonic minimal embedding condition (4.29), the bosonic equation (5.43) acquires the r.h.s. If we now look at the supergravity curvature constraint (5.6) we realize that the r.h.s. of (5.43) contains components of the field strength $F^{(4)}$ of the $D = 11$ supergravity gauge field $A^{(3)}$. Hence, the r.h.s. of (5.43) describes the coupling of the supermembrane to $A^{(3)}$. Its form is the same as that obtained from the Wess–Zumino term of the supermembrane worldvolume action (5.1). To see this we should take the corresponding $e^{\alpha q} e^{\beta r}$ components of the curvature pullback (5.6) and make use of the basic superembedding condition (4.39), the relation (5.22), the form of the Γ–matrices (4.42), (4.43) and the harmonic relations (4.41), (4.53). If we do this, and take the leading ($\eta = 0$) component of eq. (5.43) in the Wess–Zumino gauge (5.37)–(5.40), the r.h.s. of (5.43) takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} - \frac{i}{32}\gamma^{a\alpha\beta}\delta^{qr} R_{\alpha q\beta r,a}{}^i|_{\eta=0} &= -\frac{1}{3!}\epsilon^{abc} E^{\underline{d}}_a E^{\underline{c}}_b E^{\underline{b}}_c F_{\underline{bcd}}{}^{\underline{a}} u_{\underline{a}}{}^i \\ &= -\frac{1}{3!\sqrt{-g}}\epsilon^{lmn} E^{\underline{d}}_l E^{\underline{c}}_n E^{\underline{b}}_n F_{\underline{bcd}}{}^{\underline{a}} u_{\underline{a}}{}^i, \end{aligned} \tag{5.44}$$

where

$$E^{\underline{A}}_m \equiv \partial_m Z^{\underline{M}} E^{\underline{A}}_{\underline{M}}|_{\eta=0}, \qquad g_{mn}(\xi) = e^a_m e_{na}(\xi) = E^{\underline{a}}_m E^{\underline{b}}_n \eta_{\underline{ab}}.$$

The $\eta = 0$ component of the left–hand side of eq. (5.43) is rewritten as follows

$$\begin{aligned} & \eta^{ab}(\nabla_a E^{\underline{a}}_b) u_{\underline{a}}{}^i|_{\eta=0} = \eta^{ab} e^m_a(\xi)(\nabla_m e^n_b E^{\underline{a}}_n) u_{\underline{a}}{}^i(\xi) - \eta^{ab}\psi^{\alpha q}_a(\xi)(\nabla_{\alpha q} E^{\underline{a}}_b) u_{\underline{a}}{}^i(\xi) \\ = \;& \frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}}\nabla_m\left(\sqrt{-g} g^{mn} E^{\underline{a}}_n\right) u_{\underline{a}}{}^i - 2i g^{mn} E^{\underline{\alpha}}_m v_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\alpha q} E^{\underline{\beta}}_n v_{\underline{\beta},\alpha r'} (\gamma^i)_q{}^{r'} \\ = \;& \frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}}\nabla_m\left(\sqrt{-g} g^{mn} E^{\underline{a}}_n\right) u_{\underline{a}}{}^i - 2i E^{\underline{\alpha}}_m v_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\alpha q} (\gamma^{[m}\gamma^{n]})_{\alpha\beta} E^{\underline{\beta}}_n v_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\beta r'} (\gamma^i)_{qr'} \\ = \;& \frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}}\nabla_m\left(\sqrt{-g} g^{mn} E^{\underline{a}}_n\right) u_{\underline{a}}{}^i - \frac{2i}{\sqrt{-g}}\epsilon^{lmn} E^{\underline{\alpha}}_m v_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\alpha q} (\gamma^l)_{\alpha\beta} E^{\underline{\beta}}_n v_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\beta r'} (\gamma^i)_{qr'} \\ = \;& \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}}\partial_m\left(\sqrt{-g} g^{mn} E^{\underline{a}}_n\right) + g^{mn} E^{\underline{A}}_m E^{\underline{b}}_n \Omega_{\underline{A},\underline{b}}{}^{\underline{a}}\right] u_{\underline{a}}{}^i - \frac{i}{\sqrt{-g}}\epsilon^{lmn} E^{\underline{b}}_l \bar{E}_m \Gamma_{\underline{b}}{}^{\underline{a}} E_n u_{\underline{a}}{}^i. \end{aligned} \tag{5.45}$$

When developing eq. (5.45) we used the relations (5.37)–(5.40) and (5.16), the harmonic relations (4.41), the Γ–matrices (5.11) and (5.12), and the fermionic equation (5.31).

Putting together (5.44) and (5.45) we finally get

$$\left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}}\partial_m\left(\sqrt{-g}g^{mn}E_n^{\underline{a}}\right)+g^{mn}E_m^{\underline{A}}E_n^{\underline{b}}\Omega_{\underline{A},\underline{b}}{}^{\underline{a}}+\frac{1}{3!\sqrt{-g}}\epsilon^{lmn}E_l^{\underline{D}}E_n^{\underline{C}}E_n^{\underline{B}}F_{\underline{BCD}}{}^{\underline{a}}\right]u_{\underline{a}}{}^{i}=0, \tag{5.46}$$

where

$$\epsilon^{lmn}E_l^{\underline{D}}E_m^{\underline{C}}E_n^{\underline{B}}F_{\underline{BCD}}{}^{\underline{a}}=\epsilon^{lmn}[E_l^{\underline{d}}E_m^{\underline{c}}E_n^{\underline{b}}F_{\underline{bcd}}{}^{\underline{a}}-3!iE_l^{\underline{b}}\bar{E}_m\Gamma_{\underline{b}}{}^{\underline{a}}E_n]$$

is the pullback onto the bosonic worldvolume of the constrained field strength (5.7).

In the square brackets of (5.46) one can recognize the conventional scalar field equations of the supermembrane [9] obtained from the action (5.1). If we multiply them by $E_{m\underline{a}}$ we may check that they are identically zero (modulo the fermionic equations (5.41)), which reflects the $d=3$ worldvolume reparametrization invariance of the theory. Hence, indeed, only eight worldvolume scalar field equations are independent.

To conclude this subsection we repeat the main expressions which describe the $D=11$ supermembrane in the superembedding approach.

5.1.3 Main superembedding equations for the M2–brane

The superembedding conditions are

$$E^{\underline{a}}(X^{\underline{m}}(z),\Theta^{\underline{\mu}}(z))=e^a u_a{}^{\underline{a}}(z)\quad\Rightarrow\quad E_{\alpha q}^{\underline{a}}=0, \tag{5.47}$$

$$E^{\underline{\alpha}}(X^{\underline{m}}(z),\Theta^{\underline{\mu}}(z))=\frac{1}{2}(1-\bar{\Gamma})^{\underline{\alpha}}_{\underline{\beta}}\,e^aE_a^{\underline{\beta}}+e^{\alpha q}v_{\alpha q}^{\underline{\alpha}}(z), \tag{5.48}$$

$$\frac{1}{2}(1-\bar{\Gamma})^{\underline{\alpha}}_{\underline{\beta}}\equiv v_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\alpha q'}v_{\alpha q'}^{\underline{\alpha}},\quad \bar{\Gamma}=\frac{1}{3!}\epsilon^{abc}\Gamma_{abc},\quad \Gamma_a=E_a^{\underline{a}}\Gamma_{\underline{a}}.$$

This form of the projector was introduced in [94, 53].

The supermembrane equations of motion (encoded in (5.47) and (5.48)) are

$$(\nabla_{\beta r}E_a^{\underline{a}})u_{\underline{a}}{}^{i}(\gamma^a)^{\alpha\beta}=0=(\gamma^a)^{\alpha}{}_{\beta}E_a^{\underline{\beta}}v_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\beta q'}, \tag{5.49}$$

$$\left(\eta^{ab}\nabla_aE_b^{\underline{a}}+\frac{1}{3!}\epsilon^{abc}E_a^{\underline{d}}E_b^{\underline{c}}E_c^{\underline{b}}F_{\underline{bcd}}{}^{\underline{a}}\right)u_{\underline{a}}{}^{i}=0. \tag{5.50}$$

In the static gauge $X^a=\xi^a$, $\Theta^{\underline{\alpha}}v_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\beta r}=\eta^{\beta r}$, in flat target superspace and in the flat (linearized) limit of the worldvolume supergeometry, where $E_{\alpha q}^{\underline{a}}=D_{\alpha q}X^{\underline{a}}-iD_{\alpha q}\Theta\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\Theta$, the superembedding condition reduces to the superfield constraint on the transversal oscillations of the supermembrane

$$D_{\alpha q}X^i=i(\gamma^i)_q{}^{q'}\theta_{\alpha q'},\quad \theta_{\alpha q'}\equiv\Theta^{\underline{\alpha}}v_{\underline{\alpha},\alpha q'}. \tag{5.51}$$

This constraint describes an $n=8$, $d=3$ on–shell scalar supermultiplet.

Note that acting on $\Theta^{\underline{\alpha}}$ by the harmonics $v_{\underline{\alpha}}^{\ \beta r}$ and $v_{\underline{\alpha},\alpha q'}$ we transform the worldvolume scalar fermions $\Theta^{\underline{\alpha}}$ into the worldvolume spinors $\theta^{\beta r}$ and $\theta_{\alpha q'}$. When this is done, eq. (5.49) becomes the standard $d = 3$ Dirac equation for $\theta_{\alpha q'}$. Indeed, using the superembedding relations, it is a simple exercise to varify that in flat target superspace, where $E^{\underline{\alpha}} = d\Theta^{\underline{\alpha}}$, eq. (5.49) can be rewritten (modulo (5.43) or (5.50)) in the Dirac form

$$(\gamma^a)^{\alpha\beta}\mathcal{D}_a\theta_{\beta q'} = 0, \tag{5.52}$$

where $\mathcal{D}_a = e_a^{\ M}\partial_M + \omega_{a\beta}^{\ \ \gamma} + A_{aq'}^{\ \ r'}$ is the worldvolume covariant derivative.

Thus, the supersymmetric field theory in the worldvolume of the supermembrane governed by eqs. (5.49) and (5.50) is that of the $n = 8$, $d = 3$ scalar supermultiplet having eight bosonic and eight fermionic physical modes.

5.2 The super–5–brane

We now turn to the most impressive example of the power of superembedding which has allowed one to get the on–shell description of the M–theory 5–brane without using the action principle [51, 52].

The supersurface $\mathcal{M}_{6,16}$ associated with the super–5–brane worldvolume is characterized by a local supervielbein frame $e^A(z) = (e^a,\ e^{\alpha q})$ $(a = 0, 1, ..., 5,\ \alpha = 1, ..., 4;$ $q = 1, ..., 4)$ whose components form the vector and spinor representations of the group $SO(1,5) \times SO(5)$. Namely, the index α stands for a spinor representation of $SU^*(4) \sim Spin(1,5)$ and the index q is that of the spinor representation of $USp(4) \sim Spin(5)$.

The $d = 6$ spinors are $USp(4)$ simplectic Majorana–Weyl spinors [117, 120]. They are defined in the same way as the $SU(2)$ simplectic Majorana–Weyl spinors, which we introduced in Subsection 2.5.4, eqs. (2.73)–(2.74).

$$\overline{e^{\alpha q}} := \bar{e}_q^{\dot\alpha} = B^{\dot\alpha}_{\ \beta}e^{\beta r}C_{rq}, \tag{5.53}$$

where C_{qr} is the antisymmetric $USp(4)$ invariant tensor, its inverse being $(C^{-1})^{qr} = -C^{qr} \equiv -C_{qr}$. The matrices C^{qr} and C_{qr} can be used to raise and lower the $USp(4)$ spinor indices using the rules $e_r = e^qC_{qr}$, $e^q = C^{qr}e_r$.

The matrix B is defined by the conditions

$$B\gamma^aB^{-1} = (\gamma^a)^*, \quad B^*B = -1$$

and * denotes complex conjugation.

The 4×4 matrices $(\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta}$ are antisymmetric.

We note that the matrix $B^{\dot\alpha}_{\ \beta}$ can be used to convert the dotted indices (of the complex conjugate representation) into undotted ones, so that one can always deal with only undotted indices, but there is no $SU^*(4)$ invariant tensor for lowering the $SU^*(4)$ spinor

indices. Thus, the spinors $\psi^{\alpha q}$ and ψ^q_α have different $SU^*(4)$ chiralities, one of them is chiral (Weyl) and another one is antichiral.

The supersurface $\mathcal{M}_{6,16}$ under consideration is therefore a $d = 6$, $(2,0)$ chiral superspace (where 2 stands for $USp(4)$) [†].

An appropriate form of the $D = 11$ Γ–matrices (4.42), (4.43) and of the charge conjugation matrices $C_{\underline{\alpha\beta}} = C^{\underline{\alpha\beta}}$, which reflects the embedding of $\mathcal{M}_{6,16}$ into $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_{11,32}$, is

$$\Gamma^a_{\underline{\alpha\beta}} = \begin{pmatrix} -\gamma^a_{\alpha\beta} C_{qr} & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{\gamma}^{a\alpha\beta} C^{qr} \end{pmatrix}, \quad a = 0, 1, ..., 5\,, \tag{5.54}$$

$$\Gamma^i_{\underline{\alpha\beta}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \delta^\alpha_\beta (\gamma^i)_q{}^r \\ -\delta^\beta_\alpha (\gamma^i)^q{}_r & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad i = 1, ..., 5\,, \tag{5.55}$$

$$C_{\underline{\alpha\beta}} = C^{\underline{\alpha\beta}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \delta^\alpha_\beta \delta^r_q \\ -\delta^\beta_\alpha \delta^q_r & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5.56}$$

In (5.55) $(\gamma^i)^q{}_r = C^{qs}(\gamma^i)_s{}^t C_{tr}$ are $USp(4) \sim SO(5)$ gamma–matrices. The matrices $(\gamma^i)_{qr} = (\gamma^i)_q{}^t C_{tr}$ are antisymmetric.

In (5.54) the $SU^*(4)$ matrices $\gamma^a_{\alpha\beta}$ and $\tilde{\gamma}^{a\alpha\beta}$ are antisymmetric and defined by the following relations

$$\gamma^a_{\alpha\gamma}\tilde{\gamma}^{b\gamma\beta} + \gamma^b_{\alpha\gamma}\tilde{\gamma}^{a\gamma\beta} = 2\delta^\beta_\alpha \eta^{ab}, \qquad \mathrm{tr}(\gamma^a\tilde{\gamma}^b) = 4\eta^{ab}, \quad \gamma_{a\alpha\beta}\gamma^a_{\gamma\delta} = -2\epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}. \tag{5.57}$$

$$(\gamma^{[a}\tilde{\gamma}^b\gamma^{c]})_{\alpha\beta} \equiv \gamma^{abc}_{\alpha\beta} = \gamma^{abc}_{\beta\alpha} = -\frac{1}{6}\epsilon^{abcdef}(\gamma_{def})_{\alpha\beta}. \tag{5.58}$$

$$(\tilde{\gamma}^{[a}\gamma^b\tilde{\gamma}^{c]})^{\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{6}\epsilon^{abcdef}(\tilde{\gamma}_d\gamma_e\tilde{\gamma}_f)^{\alpha\beta}. \tag{5.59}$$

Eqs. (5.58) and (5.59) imply that the antisymmetric product of three $SO(1,5)$ γ–matrices is symmetric in spinor indices and (anti)–self–dual in vector indices.

The $SU^*(4) \times USp(4)$ splitting of the $D = 11$ Lorentz–spinor harmonics $v_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\underline{\beta}}$ and their inverse is as follows

$$v_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\underline{\beta}} = (v_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\beta r}, v_{\underline{\alpha},\beta r}), \quad (v^{-1})_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\underline{\alpha}} = (v_{\beta r}{}^{\underline{\alpha}}, v^{\beta r,\underline{\alpha}}). \tag{5.60}$$

The induced supergeometry on $\mathcal{M}_{6,16}$ is described by the general superembedding conditions (4.36)–(4.39), (4.46)–(4.51), (4.56)–(4.59), (4.65). As in the case of the supermembrane, our goal is to find further restrictions on components of $\hat{\Omega}_a{}^i = e^A \hat{\Omega}_{A,a}{}^i$ required by the integrability of the superembedding conditions and to identify these restrictions with the 5–brane equations of motion. So we repeat the steps made in the previous subsection.

[†]The $N = 1$, $D = 6$ superspace with one $SU(2)$ simplectic Majorana–Weyl coordinate (discussed in Subsection 2.5.4) is also called $D = 6$, (1,0) chiral superspace, since the number of its Grassmann coordinates is half the number of those in the $(2,0)$ superspace.

We again analyze the condition (4.58). Making use of the harmonic relations (4.41) and (5.60), the form of the $D = 11$ Γ–matrices (5.54) and (5.55), and the equations (4.46) and (4.49), we rewrite eq. (4.58) in the following form

$$\begin{aligned} e^a\hat{\Omega}_a{}^i &= e^a\nabla E_a{}^{\underline{b}}u_{\underline{b}}{}^i = e^a(du_a{}^{\underline{b}} + u_a{}^{\underline{c}}\Omega_{\underline{c}}{}^{\underline{b}})u_{\underline{b}}{}^i \\ &= -2ie^{\alpha q}e^{\beta r}(\gamma^i)_q{}^s h_{\alpha r,\beta s} + 2ie^a e^{\alpha q}(\gamma^i)_q{}^r E_a^{\underline{\beta}} v_{\underline{\beta},\alpha r}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.61}$$

Comparing the left– and the right–hand side of (5.61) we find that

$$e^a e^b\hat{\Omega}_{b,a}{}^i = 0 \quad \rightarrow \quad \hat{\Omega}_{b,a}{}^i = \hat{\Omega}_{a,b}{}^i = \nabla_b E_a{}^{\underline{b}}u_{\underline{b}}{}^i, \tag{5.62}$$

$$\hat{\Omega}_{\alpha q,a}{}^i = \nabla_{\alpha q}E_a{}^{\underline{b}}u_{\underline{b}}{}^i = 2i(\gamma^i)_q{}^r E_a^{\underline{\beta}} v_{\underline{\beta},\alpha r}, \tag{5.63}$$

and

$$(\gamma^i)_q{}^s h_{\alpha r,\beta s} = -(\gamma^i)_r{}^s h_{\beta q,\alpha s}. \tag{5.64}$$

In the basis of the $SO(1,5) \times SO(5)$ γ–matrices an arbitrary matrix $h_{\alpha q,\beta r}$ has the following decomposition

$$h_{\alpha q,\beta r} = C_{qr}[h_a\gamma^a_{\alpha\beta} + \frac{1}{6}h_{abc}\gamma^{abc}_{\alpha\beta}] + \gamma^{ij}_{qr}[h_{[ij]a}\gamma^a_{\alpha\beta} + h_{[ij]abc}\gamma^{abc}_{\alpha\beta}]. \tag{5.65}$$

Substituting eq. (5.65) into (5.64) we find that the only nonzero component of $h_{\alpha q,\beta r}$ is

$$h_{\alpha q,\beta r} = C_{qr}h_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{6}C_{qr}h_{abc}\gamma^{abc}_{\alpha\beta}, \quad h_{abc} = \frac{1}{6}\epsilon_{abcdef}h^{def}, \tag{5.66}$$

where $h_{abc}(z)$ is a self–dual tensor due to the γ–matrix relations (5.58).

The matrix $h_{\alpha\beta}$ satisfies the identities

$$h_{\alpha\gamma}\tilde{\gamma}^{a\gamma\delta}h_{\delta\beta} = -2h^{abc}h_{bcd}\gamma^d_{\alpha\beta}, \tag{5.67}$$

$$\tilde{\gamma}^{\alpha\gamma}_a h_{\gamma\delta}\tilde{\gamma}^{a\delta\beta} = 0, \tag{5.68}$$

$$\mathrm{tr}(h\tilde{\gamma}_{[a}\gamma_b\tilde{\gamma}_{c]}) = -8h_{abc}, \tag{5.69}$$

which we shall use below.

We have thus observed that the integrability of the superembedding conditions reveals the presence of a self–dual tensor field on the embedded supersurface. Later on this self–dual tensor will be related to the field strength $H^{(3)} = db^{(2)} - A^{(3)}$ of the 5–brane tensor gauge field which appeared in the M5–brane action (5.3).

In view of eq. (5.66) the general embedding condition (4.51) reduces to

$$E^{\underline{\beta}}_{\alpha q} \equiv e^M_{\alpha q}\partial_M Z^{\underline{M}}E^{\underline{\beta}}_{\underline{M}} = v_{\alpha q}{}^{\underline{\beta}}(z) + h_{\alpha\beta}C_{qr}v^{\beta r,\underline{\beta}}. \tag{5.70}$$

We may now derive the $e^{\alpha q}e^{\beta r}$ components of the supersurface torsion (4.57) and (4.66).

Using eqs. (4.57) and (5.70), the harmonic relations (4.41), the Γ–matrix decomposition (5.54) and the identity (5.67) we get

$$T^a_{\alpha q,\beta r} = -2iC_{qr}\gamma^b_{\alpha\beta} m_b{}^a, \quad m_b{}^a \equiv \delta_b{}^a - 2h_{bcd}h^{acd}. \tag{5.71}$$

We observe that eq. (5.71) differs from the standard supergravity torsion constraint (5.23) by the non–unit matrix $m_b{}^a$. The reason for this is that (as in the case of the bosonic surface) we have chosen the bosonic embedding condition (4.36) such that the induced metric of the embedded surface is of the standard 'Green–Schwarz' type (4.38) which is used in the construction of the M5–brane action (5.3). If we wanted to have the standard constraint on the torsion of the supersurface $\mathcal{M}_{6,16}$ (i.e. with $\delta_b{}^a$ instead of $m_b{}^a$ in (5.71)), we should redefine the $\mathcal{M}_{6,16}$ supervielbein e^a in (4.36) as follows

$$E^a \equiv E^{\underline{b}} u_{\underline{b}}{}^a(z) = e^a(z) = \hat{e}^b m_b{}^a,$$

The price for this would be that in the new frame $\hat{e}^a$ the metric $\hat{g}_{mn} = \hat{e}^a_m \hat{e}_{na}$ on $\mathcal{M}_{6,16}$ does not coincide with the induced metric of the Green–Schwarz–type. So we prefer to work in the standard (induced) frame on $\mathcal{M}_{6,16}$ [†].

We now look at the $e^{\alpha q}e^{\beta r}$ components of the torsion $T^{\gamma s}$ (4.66). Because of our choice of the supersurface connection (4.62), (4.65) and the presence of the tensor $h(z)$, they are nonzero and have the following form

$$T^{\gamma s}_{\alpha q,\beta r} = -C_{qt}h_{\alpha\delta}(\nabla_{\beta r}v^{\delta t,\underline{\alpha}})v_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\gamma s} + (\alpha q) \ \leftrightarrow \ (\beta r). \tag{5.72}$$

In view of (5.71) and (5.72) the anticommutator of the supersurface covariant derivatives $\mathcal{D}_{\alpha q}$ gets modified and acquires an additional term in comparison with that of the supermembrane (5.25)

$$\{\mathcal{D}_{\alpha q}, \mathcal{D}_{\beta r}\} = 2iC_{qr}\gamma^a_{\alpha\beta} m_a{}^b \mathcal{D}_b - T^{\gamma s}_{\alpha q,\beta r}\mathcal{D}_{\gamma s} + R_{\alpha q,\beta r}(z). \tag{5.73}$$

5.2.1 The tensor field equation

We are now in a position to relate $h_{abc}(z)$ to the field strength $H_{lmn}(\xi)$ of the worldvolume gauge field $b_{mn}(\xi)$ of the M5–brane action. By definition, in the bosonic worldvolume (5.2)

$$H^{(3)} = db - A^{(3)}. \tag{5.74}$$

The Bianchi identity for (5.74) is

$$dH^{(3)} = -dA^{(3)} = F^{(4)}, \tag{5.75}$$

where $A^{(3)}$ and $F^{(4)}$ are the pullbacks onto the bosonic worldvolume of the $D = 11$ gauge field potential and of its field strength, respectively.

[†]The $\hat{e}^a$–frame has been used for the description of the M5–brane superembedding in the reference [51], and the transition to the Green–Schwarz frame has been discussed in [52].

To find the relation between $H^{(3)}$ and $h_{abc}(\xi,\eta)$ we should promote the equations (5.74) and (5.75) to the supersurface $\mathcal{M}_{6,16}$, i.e. to consider $b^{(2)}(z)$ and $H^{(3)}(z)$ as $\mathcal{M}_{6,16}$ superfields.

Since $h_{abc}(z)$ carries only vector indices it is natural to assume that the superfield

$$H_{ABC} = e_A{}^L e_B{}^M e_C{}^N H_{LMN}(Z),$$

also has only nonzero components with three vector indices $H_{abc}(z)$, i.e.

$$H_{\alpha q,BC}(z) = 0. \tag{5.76}$$

The assumption (5.76) about the structure of the superform $H^{(3)}$ is consistent with the Bianchi identity (5.75) extended to the supersurface, which allows one to express $H_{abc}(z)$ in terms of $h_{abc}(z)$ and to find the equation of motion of $h_{abc}(z)$ (or $H_{abc}(z)$), as we shall do in a moment.

We should stress in advance that eq. (5.76) is *not* an additional constraint on the superembedding since, as the analysis has shown [51, 52], the equations for $h_{abc}(z)$ which follow from the Bianchi identity (5.75) are equivalent to those which are contained in the basic superembedding condition $E^{\underline{a}}_{\alpha q} = 0$ (4.39).

Let us analyze the Bianchi identity (5.75). To this end we rewrite it in the following form

$$\begin{aligned} dH^{(3)} &= \frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{D}e^C)e^B e^A H_{ABC} + \frac{1}{6}e^D e^C e^B e^A \mathcal{D}_A H_{BCD} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}T^C e^B e^A H_{ABC} + \frac{1}{6}e^D e^C e^B e^A \mathcal{D}_D H_{ABC} = -\frac{1}{4!}e^D e^C e^B e^A F_{ABCD}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.77}$$

In view of (5.76), of the torsion constraint (5.71) and of the $D = 11$ field strength constraint (5.7), the first nonzero component of eq. (5.77) is that of $e^{\alpha q}e^{\beta r}e^c e^d$

$$iC_{qr}\gamma^a_{\alpha\beta}m_a{}^b H_{bcd} = -iE^{\underline{\alpha}}_{\alpha q}(\Gamma_{\underline{ab}})_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}}E^{\underline{\beta}}_{\beta r}E^{\underline{a}}_{c}E^{\underline{b}}_{d}. \tag{5.78}$$

Making use of the harmonic relations (4.41) and (5.60), the form (5.54)–(5.61) of the Γ–matrices, the relation (5.70) for $E^{\underline{\alpha}}_{\alpha q}$, and that $E^{\underline{a}}_{c} = u^{\underline{a}}_{c}$, we reduce (5.78) to

$$\gamma^a_{\alpha\beta}m_a{}^d H_{dbc} = -(\gamma_{[b}\tilde{\gamma}_{c]})_\alpha{}^\gamma h_{\gamma\beta} - h_{\alpha\gamma}(\tilde{\gamma}_{[b}\gamma_{c]})^\gamma{}_\beta. \tag{5.79}$$

Then, multiplying (5.79) by $\tilde{\gamma}_a^{\beta\alpha}$ and making use of the identities (5.57) and (5.69), we finally arrive at the relation between H_{abc} and h_{abc}

$$m_a{}^d H_{dbc} = 4h_{abc} \;\Leftrightarrow\; H_{abc} = 4(m^{-1})_a{}^d h_{dbc}. \tag{5.80}$$

Using the self–duality of h_{abc} and the definition (5.71) of $m_a{}^b = \delta_a{}^b - 2h_{acd}h^{bcd}$ one can show that

$$(m^{-1})_a{}^b = \frac{1}{1-\frac{2}{3}k^2}(2\delta_a{}^b - m_a{}^b), \quad k_a{}^b \equiv h_{acd}h^{bcd}, \quad k^2 \equiv \frac{1}{6}\mathrm{tr}(kk). \tag{5.81}$$

It is then not hard to check that the r.h.s. of (5.80) is indeed totally antisymmetric because of the self–duality of h_{abc}. For this one should notice that $k_a{}^d h_{dbc}$ is anti–self–dual

$$k_a{}^d h_{dbc} = -\frac{1}{6}\epsilon_{abcdef} k^{dd_1} h_{d_1}{}^{ef}. \tag{5.82}$$

The form of the expressions (5.80) implies that though h_{abc} obeys ordinary Hodge self–duality (5.66), the field strength H_{abc} satisfies a much more complicated nonlinear self–duality condition. Its explicit form can be derived from the M5–brane action (5.3) as an equation of motion of b_{mn} [162, 159, 63, 64], or directly from (5.80) [163]. We refer the reader to these papers for details on the different forms of the generalized self–duality condition.

Note that at the linearized level, when $m_b{}^a$ is replaced with $\delta_b{}^a$, H_{abc} becomes proportional to h_{abc} and satisfies the ordinary Hodge self–duality condition.

When the field strength of a gauge field is self–dual, its Bianchi identities are equivalent to the gauge field equations of motion. We shall now show how the Bianchi identities (5.75) produce the tensor field equations in the case under consideration.

Consider the $e^a e^b e^c e^d$ component of the Bianchi identity (5.77). It has the form

$$\frac{1}{6}\epsilon^{abcdef}\left(\mathcal{D}_c H_{def} + 3T_{cd}^{f_1} H_{eff_1}\right) = -\frac{1}{4!}\epsilon^{abcdef} E_c^{\underline{D}} E_d^{\underline{C}} E_e^{\underline{B}} E_f^{\underline{A}} F_{\underline{ABCD}}, \tag{5.83}$$

or

$$\frac{1}{6}\epsilon^{abcdef}\hat{\mathcal{D}}_c H_{def} = -\frac{1}{4!}\epsilon^{abcdef} E_c^{\underline{D}} E_d^{\underline{C}} E_e^{\underline{B}} E_f^{\underline{A}} F_{\underline{ABCD}}, \tag{5.84}$$

where, for convenience, we have introduced the covariant derivative $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_c$

$$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_c = e_c{}^M \partial_M + \hat{\omega}_{c,ba} = e_c{}^M \partial_M + \left(\omega_{c,ba} - \frac{1}{2}(T_{cb,a} - T_{ca,b} - T_{ba,c})\right). \tag{5.85}$$

Note that in the pure bosonic limit the connection $\hat{\omega}_{ba}$ is torsion free, i.e. for such a connection the components $\hat{T}^a_{bc}$ of the torsion $\hat{T}^a = \hat{\mathcal{D}} e^a$ are zero.

We now substitute H_{def} in (5.84) with $(m^{-1})_d{}^{f_1} h_{f_1 ef}$ (5.80), and use the relations (5.81), (5.71) and (5.82) to get

$$4\hat{\mathcal{D}}_c\left(\frac{1}{1-\frac{2}{3}k^2} m_d^c h^{dab}\right) = -\frac{1}{4!}\epsilon^{abcdef} E_c^{\underline{D}} E_d^{\underline{C}} E_e^{\underline{B}} E_f^{\underline{A}} F_{\underline{ABCD}}. \tag{5.86}$$

Eq. (5.86) is the equation of motion for the self–dual tensor field h_{abc}.

We conclude that the Bianchi identity (5.75) with $H^{(3)}$ defined by the relation (5.80) is equivalent to the field equations of the self–dual worldvolume tensor field.

Let us now proceed with deriving

5.2.2 The fermionic equation

To get the fermionic field $\Theta^{\underline{\mu}}(z)$ equation of the $M5$–brane we hit the left– and the right–hand side of eq. (5.70) with the covariant derivative $\mathcal{D}_{\beta r}$, symmetrize with respect to the

pairs of indices (αq) and (βr), and multiply the resulting expression by $v_{\underline{\beta},\gamma s}$. We thus obtain

$$iC_{qr}\gamma^a_{\alpha\beta}m_a{}^b E_b^{\underline{\beta}} v_{\underline{\beta},\gamma s} + C_{qt}h_{\alpha\delta}(\nabla_{\beta r}v^{\delta t,\underline{\alpha}})v_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\sigma t_1}E^{\underline{\beta}}_{\sigma t_1}v_{\underline{\beta},\gamma s} - E^{\underline{\alpha}}_{\alpha q}\Omega_{\beta r,\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\underline{\beta}}v_{\underline{\beta},\gamma s} + (\alpha q) \;\leftrightarrow\; (\beta r)$$
$$= \mathcal{D}_{\beta r}v_{\alpha q}^{\underline{\beta}}v_{\underline{\beta},\gamma s} + (\mathcal{D}_{\beta r}h_{\alpha\delta}C_{qt}v^{\delta t,\underline{\beta}})v_{\underline{\beta},\gamma s} + (\alpha q) \;\leftrightarrow\; (\beta r). \tag{5.87}$$

To simplify eq. (5.87) we should make use of the expression (5.70), the identity (5.67), the relations (4.62) and (4.65) between the supersurface connection $\omega_A{}^B$ and the target superspace connection $\Omega_{\underline{A}}{}^{\underline{B}}$, and to recall that due to the harmonic relations (4.59) and (4.76), and the form of the Γ–matrices (5.54) and (5.55)

$$(\nabla_{\beta r}v_{\alpha q}^{\underline{\beta}})v_{\underline{\beta},\gamma s} = \frac{1}{4}(\nabla_{\beta r}u_a^{\underline{a}})u_{\underline{a}}{}^i\gamma^a_{\alpha\gamma}(\gamma_i)_{qs} \equiv \frac{1}{4}\hat{\Omega}_{\beta r,a}{}^i\gamma^a_{\alpha\gamma}(\gamma_i)_{qs},$$
$$(\nabla_{\beta r}v^{\alpha q,\underline{\beta}})v_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\gamma s} = \frac{1}{4}(\nabla_{\beta r}u_a^{\underline{a}})u_{\underline{a}}{}^i\gamma^{a\alpha\gamma}(\gamma_i)^{qs} \equiv \frac{1}{4}\hat{\Omega}_{\beta r,a}{}^i\gamma^{a\alpha\gamma}(\gamma_i)^{qs}. \tag{5.88}$$

We thus reduce (5.87) to

$$2iC_{qr}\gamma^a_{\alpha\beta}m_a{}^b E_b^{\underline{\beta}}v_{\underline{\beta},\gamma s} = \frac{1}{4}\gamma^b_{\alpha\gamma}m_b{}^a\hat{\Omega}_{\beta r,a}{}^i(\gamma_i)_{qs} + \mathcal{D}_{\beta r}h_{\alpha\gamma}C_{qs} + (\alpha q) \;\leftrightarrow\; (\beta r). \tag{5.89}$$

Let us multiply eq. (5.89) by C^{qr} and $\tilde{\gamma}_c^{\beta\alpha}\tilde{\gamma}^{c\delta\gamma}$. Because of the identity (5.68) the term with the covariant derivative of $h_{\alpha\gamma}$ vanishes and we get

$$16i\tilde{\gamma}_b^{\delta\gamma}m^{ba}E_{\underline{a}}^{\underline{\beta}}v_{\underline{\beta},\gamma s} = -\tilde{\gamma}_b^{\delta\gamma}m^{ba}\hat{\Omega}_{\gamma q,a}{}^i(\gamma_i)^q{}_s. \tag{5.90}$$

Now take the relation (5.63) and multiply it by $(\gamma_i)^q{}_s$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_b^{\delta\alpha}m^{ba}$. We have

$$10i\tilde{\gamma}_b^{\delta\gamma}m^{ba}E_{\underline{a}}^{\underline{\beta}}v_{\underline{\beta},\gamma s} = -\tilde{\gamma}_b^{\delta\gamma}m^{ba}\hat{\Omega}_{\gamma q,a}{}^i(\gamma_i)^q{}_s. \tag{5.91}$$

Comparing (5.90) with (5.91) we see that the coefficients on their left–hand sides do not match, and hence (also in view of (5.63))

$$\tilde{\gamma}_b^{\alpha\beta}m^{ba}E_{\underline{a}}^{\underline{\beta}}v_{\underline{\beta},\beta q} = 0 = \tilde{\gamma}_b^{\alpha\beta}m^{ba}\hat{\Omega}_{\beta q,a}{}^i. \tag{5.92}$$

We have thus arrived at the **16**–component fermionic field equation of motion of the $M5$–brane similar to that of the supermembrane (5.31), the only difference being in the presence of the worldvolume self–dual tensor $h_{abc}(z)$ in the $M5$–brane equation via the matrix $m_b{}^a = \delta_b{}^a - h_{bcd}h^{acd}$.

Let us now rewrite eq. (5.92) in the Green–Schwarz form similar to the supermembrane equation (5.34).

First of all we use the harmonic relations (4.41) and (5.60), the form of the Γ–matrices (5.54), and the embedding conditions $E_{\underline{a}}^{\underline{\beta}}v_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\alpha q} = 0$ (4.47) and $E_{\underline{a}}^{\underline{a}} = u_a{}^{\underline{a}}$ (4.38) to get

$$m^{ba}E_{\underline{a}}^{\underline{\beta}}(E_b^{\underline{a}}\Gamma_{\underline{a}})_{\underline{\beta\gamma}}v^{\alpha q,\underline{\gamma}} = 0. \tag{5.93}$$

Then, to 'hide' the supersurface spinor indices, we multiply (5.93) by

$$E_{\underline{\alpha},\alpha q} \equiv v_{\underline{\alpha}\alpha q} - v_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\beta r} h_{\beta\alpha} C_{rq}. \tag{5.94}$$

We get

$$m^{ba} E_a^{\underline{\beta}} (E_b^{\underline{a}} \Gamma_{\underline{a}})_{\underline{\beta\gamma}} v^{\alpha q,\underline{\gamma}} E_{\underline{\alpha},\alpha q} \equiv \frac{1}{2} m^{ba} E_a^{\underline{\beta}} \left[E_b^{\underline{a}} \Gamma_{\underline{a}} (1 - \bar{\Gamma}) \right]_{\underline{\beta\alpha}} = 0. \tag{5.95}$$

The choice of the matrix $E_{\underline{\alpha},\alpha q}$ is prompted by the requirement that the resulting fermionic equation is invariant under the κ–symmetry transformations (as the superbrane dynamical equations must always be). This means that this equation should be annihilated by the κ–symmetry projector (4.80), (4.81) whose form is

$$\frac{1}{2}(1 + \bar{\Gamma})^{\underline{\alpha}}{}_{\underline{\beta}} \equiv v_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\beta r} E_{\beta r}^{\underline{\alpha}} = v_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\beta r} (v_{\beta r}^{\underline{\alpha}} + C_{rs} h_{\beta\gamma} v^{\gamma s,\underline{\alpha}}). \tag{5.96}$$

So we have chosen $E_{\underline{\alpha},\alpha q}$ in such a way that $E_{\beta r}^{\underline{\alpha}} E_{\underline{\alpha},\alpha q} \equiv 0$.

Finally we use the form (5.66) of $h_{\beta\alpha}$ and the harmonic relations (4.41) to find the explicit form of the matrix $\bar{\Gamma}$ of eq. (5.95) in terms of antisymmetric products of the $D = 11$ Γ–matrices (5.54), (5.55)

$$\bar{\Gamma} = \frac{1}{6!} \epsilon^{a_1 \dots a_6} \Gamma_{a_1 \dots a_6} + \frac{1}{3} h^{abc} \Gamma_{abc}, \quad \Gamma_a = E_a^{\underline{a}} \Gamma_{\underline{a}}. \tag{5.97}$$

Thus we have derived the Green–Schwarz–type fermionic equation of motion (5.95) of the super–5–brane. In the Wess–Zumino gauge (5.37) its $\eta = 0$ component has the form

$$\frac{1}{2} m^{ba} e_b^m e_a^n E_m^{\underline{\beta}} \left[E_n^{\underline{a}} \Gamma_{\underline{a}} (1 - \bar{\Gamma}) \right]_{\underline{\beta\alpha}} = 0, \tag{5.98}$$

where $E_m^{\underline{A}} = \partial_m Z^{\underline{M}} E_{\underline{M}}^{\underline{A}}(Z(\xi))$, $(\underline{A} = \underline{\beta}, \underline{a})$.

5.2.3 The scalar equation

To identify the equations of motion of the superworldvolume scalar fields $X^{\underline{m}}(z)$ we analyze the $e^a e^{\alpha q}$ components of the pullback of the target superspace torsion $T^{\underline{\alpha}}$ (5.5) multiplied by $E_{\underline{\alpha},\beta r}$ defined in (5.94).

$$\begin{aligned} T^{\underline{\alpha}} E_{\underline{\alpha},\beta r} &\equiv (\nabla E^{\underline{\alpha}}) E_{\underline{\alpha},\beta r} \\ &= T^A E_A^{\underline{\alpha}} E_{\underline{\alpha},\beta r} + e^A (\nabla E_A^{\underline{\alpha}} - \omega_A{}^B E_B^{\underline{\alpha}}) E_{\underline{\alpha},\beta r} \\ &= T^b E_b^{\underline{\alpha}} E_{\underline{\alpha},\beta r} + e^A (\nabla E_A^{\underline{\alpha}} - \omega_A{}^B E_B^{\underline{\alpha}}) E_{\underline{\alpha},\beta r} \end{aligned} \tag{5.99}$$

where $T^A = (T^b, T^{\alpha q})$ is the supersurface induced torsion defined in (4.57) and (4.66). Note that the term with $T^{\alpha q}$ has disappeared from (5.99) since by definition $E_{\alpha q}^{\underline{\alpha}} E_{\underline{\alpha},\beta r} \equiv 0$ (see eqs. (5.94), (5.96)). The $e^a e^{\alpha q}$ components of (5.99) are

$$T_{a,\alpha q}^{\underline{\alpha}} E_{\underline{\alpha},\beta r} = T_{a,\alpha q}^b E_b^{\underline{\alpha}} E_{\underline{\alpha},\beta r} - (\nabla_{\alpha q} E_a^{\underline{\alpha}} + \omega_{\alpha q,a}^{\ b} E_b^{\underline{\alpha}}) E_{\underline{\alpha},\beta r} - (\nabla_a E_{\alpha q}^{\underline{\alpha}}) E_{\underline{\alpha},\beta r}. \tag{5.100}$$

Using the definition of $E^{\underline{\alpha}}_{\alpha q}$ (5.70) and $E_{\underline{\alpha},\beta r}$ (5.94), i.e.

$$E^{\underline{\alpha}}_{\alpha q} = v_{\alpha q}{}^{\underline{\alpha}}(z) + h_{\alpha\gamma}C_{qs}v^{\gamma s,\underline{\alpha}}, \quad E_{\underline{\alpha},\beta r} = v_{\underline{\alpha}\beta r} - v_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\gamma s}h_{\gamma\beta}C_{sr},$$

the orthogonality properties of the harmonics (5.60) and the relations (4.62), (4.64) and (5.88) for the supersurface and target superspace connections, the last term of (5.100) can be rewritten as

$$(\nabla_a E^{\underline{\alpha}}_{\alpha q})E_{\underline{\alpha},\beta r} = \frac{1}{4}\hat{\Omega}_{a,b}{}^{i}m_b{}^{c}\gamma_{c\alpha\beta}(\gamma_i)_{qr} + \mathcal{D}_a h_{\alpha\beta}C_{qr}. \tag{5.101}$$

Thus eq. (5.100) takes the following form

$$\frac{1}{4}\hat{\Omega}_{a,b}{}^{i}m_b{}^{c}\gamma_{c\alpha\beta}(\gamma_i)_{qr} + \mathcal{D}_a h_{\alpha\beta}C_{qr} = (T^{b}_{a,\alpha q}E^{\underline{\alpha}}_{b} - T^{\underline{\alpha}}_{a,\alpha q})E_{\underline{\alpha},\beta r} - K_{\alpha q,a,\beta r}, \tag{5.102}$$

where

$$K_{\alpha q,a,\beta r} \equiv (\nabla_{\alpha q}E^{\underline{\alpha}}_{a} + \omega_{\alpha q,a}{}^{b}E^{\underline{\alpha}}_{b})E_{\underline{\alpha},\beta r}$$

are components of the second fundamental form introduced in (4.60).

The equation of motion of the worldvolume scalar fields $X^{\underline{m}}(z)$ is obtained from (5.102) by multiplying the latter by $m^{ad}\tilde{\gamma}_d^{\beta\alpha}(\gamma_i)^{rq}$

$$\begin{aligned} & m^{bc}m_c{}^{a}\hat{\Omega}_{a,b}{}^{i} \equiv m^{bc}m_c{}^{a}(\nabla_a E^{\underline{a}}_{b})u_{\underline{a}}{}^{i} \\ & = \frac{1}{4}m^{ad}\tilde{\gamma}_d^{\beta\alpha}(\gamma^i)^{qr}\left[(T^{b}_{a,\alpha q}E^{\underline{\alpha}}_{b} - T^{\underline{\alpha}}_{a,\alpha q})E_{\underline{\alpha},\beta r} - K_{\alpha q,a,\beta r}\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{5.103}$$

We observe that the l.h.s. of (5.103) has the form similar to the supermembrane bosonic equation (5.43) but with the matrix $m^{bc}m_c{}^{a}$ replacing the Minkowski metric η^{ab}. The complicated r.h.s. of eq. (5.103) describes the interaction of the super–5–brane with the $D = 11$ gauge field strength $F^{(4)} = dA^{(3)}$.

Note that since (5.102) contains the vector derivative of $h_{\alpha\beta}$, from (5.102) we can also derive another form of the equation of motion of the tensor field h_{abc}. To this end we multiply (5.42) by C^{qr} and $m^{ad}(\tilde{\gamma}_{[d}\gamma_b\tilde{\gamma}_{c]})^{\alpha\beta}$. Using the identity (5.69) we get

$$m^{ad}\mathcal{D}_a h_{dbc} = -\frac{1}{32}C^{qr}m^{ad}(\tilde{\gamma}_{[d}\gamma_b\tilde{\gamma}_{c]})^{\alpha\beta}\left[(T^{b}_{a,\alpha q}E^{\underline{\alpha}}_{b} - T^{\underline{\alpha}}_{a,\alpha q})E_{\underline{\alpha},\beta r} - K_{\alpha q,a,\beta r}\right]. \tag{5.104}$$

The form of eq. (5.104) differs from that of eq. (5.76), but a somewhat tedious analysis shows that the two equations are in fact equivalent [51, 52] modulo the fermionic equation (5.95).

The five scalar field equations (5.103) have a rather complicated structure of the right–hand side. Cumbersome manipulations using the form of the torsion constraints (5.4) and (5.5), the superembedding conditions $E^{\underline{a}}_{\alpha q} = 0$ and (5.70), the harmonic relations (4.41), the form of the $D = 11$ Γ–matrices (5.54)–(5.56) and the identities (5.80)–(5.82) allow

one to disentangle eqs. (5.103) and to present their leading ($\eta = 0$) components (which are the proper equations for $x^{\underline{m}}(\xi)$) in the following form

$$\Big[G^{mn}(\mathcal{D}_n E^{\underline{a}}_m + E^{\underline{b}}_m \Omega_{n\underline{b}}{}^{\underline{a}}) - \frac{\varepsilon^{m_1\cdots m_6}}{\sqrt{-g}(1-\frac{2}{3}k^2)}\left(\frac{1}{6!}F^{\underline{a}}{}_{m_6\cdots m_1} - \frac{1}{(3!)^2}(F^{\underline{a}}{}_{m_6m_5m_4} - E^{\underline{a}}_n F^n{}_{m_6m_5m_4})H_{m_3m_2m_1}\right)\Big] u_{\underline{a}}{}^i = 0, \tag{5.105}$$

where all quantities depend only on the bosonic worldvolume coordinate ξ^m,

$$G^{mn}(\xi) = m^{bc} m_c{}^a e^m_b e^n_a(\xi),$$

$$E^{\underline{A}}_m = \partial_m Z^{\underline{M}} E^{\underline{A}}_{\underline{M}}(Z(\xi)), \qquad F_{m_p\cdots m_1} = E^{\underline{A}_p}_{m_p}\cdots E^{\underline{A}_1}_{m_1} F_{\underline{A_1}\cdots\underline{A_p}}(Z(\xi)), \quad (p=4,7)$$

and

$$\mathcal{D}_m = \partial_m + \Gamma^l_{mn}(\xi)$$

is the covariant derivative with the Christoffel symbol $\Gamma^l_{mn}(\xi)$ determined by the worldvolume induced metric $g_{mn}(\xi) = E^{\underline{a}}_m E^{\underline{b}}_n \eta_{\underline{ab}}$.

The expression in the square brackets of (5.105) is the same as the one obtained from the M5–brane action (5.3) as the $x^{\underline{m}}(\xi)$ equation of motion.

The equivalence of the M5–brane equations of motion (5.98) and (5.105), and of the 'self–duality' relation (5.80) to the equations of motion yielded by the M5–brane action (5.3) has been demonstrated in [164]. The proof is not straightforward, since in the action one deals directly with the field strength H_{mnl} and not with h_{abc}, and a projector $\frac{1}{2}(1+\Gamma)$, which appears in an natural way in the κ–symmetry transformations of the action, differs from the κ–symmetry projector (5.96), (5.97) of the superembedding approach. The two projectors are related to each other by the identities

$$\frac{1+\Gamma}{2}\ \frac{1+\bar\Gamma}{2} = \frac{1+\bar\Gamma}{2}, \quad \frac{1+\bar\Gamma}{2}\ \frac{1+\Gamma}{2} = \frac{1+\Gamma}{2}.$$

For details we refer the reader to the papers [63, 164], and to [165] where the equivalence of the covariant energy–momentum tensors of the M5–brane in both approaches has been discussed.

The two formulations of the M5–brane have been applied to studying various aspects of M–theory and its duals in [65, 166]–[170, 161, 171]–[182, 103]–[190] and [74, 191]–[196].

To summarize, in the superembedding approach the M5–brane is described by the following main relations.

5.2.4 Main superembedding equations for the M5–brane

The superembedding conditions are

$$E^{\underline{a}}(X^{\underline{m}}(z), \Theta^{\underline{\mu}}(z)) = e^a u_a{}^{\underline{a}}(z) \quad \Rightarrow \quad E^{\underline{a}}_{\alpha q} = 0, \tag{5.106}$$

$$E^{\underline{\alpha}}(X^{\underline{m}}(z),\Theta^{\underline{\mu}}(z)) = \frac{1}{2}(1-\Gamma_0)^{\underline{\alpha}}{}_{\underline{\beta}}\, e^a E_{\underline{a}}^{\underline{\beta}} + e^{\alpha q}(v_{\alpha q}^{\underline{\alpha}}(z) + h_{\alpha\beta}C_{qr}v^{\beta r,\underline{\beta}}), \tag{5.107}$$

$$h_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{6}\gamma^{abc}_{\alpha\beta}h_{abc},$$

$$\frac{1}{2}(1-\Gamma_0)^{\underline{\alpha}}{}_{\underline{\beta}} = v_{\underline{\beta},\beta r}v^{\beta r,\underline{\alpha}}, \quad \Gamma_0 = \frac{1}{6!}\epsilon^{a_1\cdots a_6}\Gamma_{a_1\cdots a_6}, \quad \Gamma_a = E_a^{\underline{a}}\Gamma_{\underline{a}}.$$

The M5–brane equations of motion encoded in (5.106) and (5.107) are the fermionic field equation

$$\tilde{\gamma}_b^{\alpha\beta}m^{ba}E_{\underline{a}}^{\underline{\beta}}v_{\underline{\beta},\beta q} = 0 = \tilde{\gamma}_b^{\alpha\beta}m^{ba}\nabla_{\beta q}E_{\underline{a}}^{\underline{b}}u_{\underline{b}}{}^i, \tag{5.108}$$

$$m_b{}^a = \delta_b{}^a - 2k_b{}^a, \quad k_b{}^a = h_{acd}h^{bcd},$$

the worldvolume scalar field equation

$$m^{bc}m_c{}^a(\nabla_a E_{\underline{b}}^{\underline{a}})u_{\underline{a}}{}^i = \frac{\varepsilon^{a_1\cdots a_6}}{1-\frac{2}{3}k^2}\left(\frac{1}{6!}F^{\underline{a}}{}_{a_6\cdots a_1} - \frac{1}{(3!)^2}F^{\underline{a}}{}_{a_6a_5a_4}H_{a_3a_2a_1}\right)u_{\underline{a}}{}^i, \tag{5.109}$$

where $F^{\underline{a}}{}_{a_p\cdots a_1} = F^{\underline{a}}{}_{\underline{a}_p\cdots\underline{a}_1}E_{a_p}^{\underline{a}_p}\cdots E_{a_1}^{\underline{a}_1}$, $(p=3,6)$;
and the self–dual tensor field equation

$$dH^{(3)} = -\frac{1}{4!}E^{\underline{D}}E^{\underline{C}}E^{\underline{B}}E^{\underline{A}}F_{\underline{ABCD}}, \quad H_{abc} = 4(m^{-1})_a{}^d h_{dbc}, \quad h_{abc} = \frac{1}{6}\epsilon_{abcdef}h^{def}. \tag{5.110}$$

As in the case of the supermembrane (see eq. (5.51)) in the linearized limit the superembedding condition (5.106) reduces to the constraint on the superfields corresponding to the transverse oscillations of the super–5–brane

$$D_{\alpha q}X^i = i(\gamma^i)_q{}^r\theta_{\alpha r}, \quad \theta_{\alpha r} \equiv \Theta^{\underline{\alpha}}v_{\underline{\alpha},\alpha r}, \quad i = 0,1\cdots 5, \quad q,r = 1,\cdots,4\,.$$

This constraint describes an $n=(2,0)$, $d=6$ on–shell tensor supermultiplet.

Thus, the supersymmetric field theory in the worldvolume of the M5–brane governed by eqs. (5.108)–(5.110) is that of the $n=(2,0)$, $d=6$ tensor supermultiplet which on the mass shell has five scalar, three (self–dual) tensor and eight fermionic physical modes.

6 Other developments and applications

6.1 The generalized action principle

In Sections 2 and 3 we have constructed doubly supersymmetric superfield actions for superparticles and superstrings which produce the basic superembedding condition $E_{\alpha q}^{\underline{a}} = 0$ dynamically. This has been possible because in these cases the superembedding condition does not contain dynamical field equations, and the latter should be obtained by imposing the minimal embedding conditions, or from an action.

This method of constructing worldvolume superfield actions can be used in other cases where the superembedding condition does not put the superbrane on the mass shell, as,

for example, $N = 2$, $D = 3, 4$ and 6 superparticles [42, 69], the $N = 2$, $D = 3$ superstring [42], the $N = 1$, $D = 4$ supermembrane [70] and an $N = 2$, $D = 4$ space–filling D3–brane.

As we have seen, in the case of the M–theory branes the superembedding condition implies the dynamical equations of motion. Therefore, if one tried to construct a worldvolume superfield action for these branes using the prescription of Sections 2 and 3, i.e. by introducing the superembedding condition into the action with a Lagrange multiplier, this Lagrange multiplier superfield would acquire dynamical equations and thus would contain redundant degrees of freedom, which are absent from the spectrum of the brane theories of interest. This is analogous, for instance, to the superfield formulations of ten–dimensional Super–Yang–Mills theory and $D = 10$ and $D = 11$ supergravities whose superfield constraints put the theories on the mass shell, and the way of constructing superfield actions for them has not been found.

In such cases one should either deal with component actions, as Green–Schwarz–type actions for the superbranes, or consider so called generalized actions, whose construction is based on a group manifold (rheonomic) approach which has been developed in application to supersymmetric field theories in [73] and in application to superbranes in [72] and, from somewhat different perspective, in [70].

The main principles of the construction of the generalized actions (which we enumerate for superbranes [72, 78]) are

i) In the superworldvolume of the superbrane with the number of bosonic dimensions $d = p + 1$ embedded into a D–dimensional target superspace one constructs a $p + 1$–superform $L^{(p+1)}$ which is closed, $dL^{(p+1)} = 0$, modulo the superembedding condition $E^a_{\overline{\alpha} q} = 0$ (or the one which replaces it in the case of the space–filling branes [75]). The superform is constructed from the pullbacks of the target–space supervielbeins, the harmonic variables (which are auxiliary worldvolume superfields) and from the field strengths of the worldvolume gauge fields, when present. It contains both the kinetic and the Wess–Zumino term of the superbrane Lagrangian. A systematic way to get this form (which can always be found) has been proposed in [70]. An example of such a form has been considered in the case of the heterotic string in Subsections 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 (eqs. (3.50) and (3.58)).

ii) The integral of this superform over an arbitrary $p + 1$–dimensional bosonic submanifold $\mathcal{M}_{p+1} = (\xi^m, \eta^\mu(\xi))$ of the superworldvolume is the generalized action

$$S = \int_{\mathcal{M}_{p+1}} L^{(p+1)}. \tag{6.1}$$

So the generalized action is not a fully fledged worldvolume superfield action.

iii) But, in spite of the fact that the integration is performed over a bosonic submanifold, the action (6.1) is superdiffeomorphism invariant in the whole superworldvolume modulo the superembedding condition

$$\delta S = \int_{\mathcal{M}_{p+1}} \delta L^{(p+1)} = \int_{\mathcal{M}_{p+1}} d(i_\delta L^{(p+1)}) + \int_{\mathcal{M}_{p+1}} i_\delta dL^{(p+1)}, \tag{6.2}$$

where $i_\delta L^{(p+1)} := \frac{1}{p!} dz^{L_p} \cdots dz^{L_1} \delta z^M L_{ML_1 \cdots L_p}$. We see that the first term in the variation (6.2) is a total derivative and the second term vanishes because of the condition i).

iv) The variation of the surface $\mathcal{M}_{p+1}$ in the action functional (6.1) is equivalent to the superdiffeomorphisms $\delta\eta(\xi)$ of the superworldvolume in the odd directions orthogonal to $\mathcal{M}_{p+1}$, which leads to the condition $dL^{(p+1)} = 0$. As a result, because of iii) the variation of the action (6.2) with respect to the worldvolume superfields yields the superembedding conditions and the superfield equations of motion in the *whole* worldvolume superspace. When contained in the superembedding conditions, the equations of motion do not produce any new information in addition to the superembedding conditions.

v) When the integration surface is chosen to be $(\xi^m; \eta^\mu = 0)$ and we take the integral of the leading component $L^{(p+1)}|_{\eta=0=d\eta}$ of the superform, the generalized action (6.1) is reduced to a component action, which can be then rewritten in the Green–Schwarz form.

An example related to the generalized action taken at $\eta = 0$ is the property of the Weil triviality of the term (3.65) of the doubly supersymmetric string action considered in Subsection 3.2.3, with the two–form (3.58) being closed up to the superembedding condition.

Because of a solid geometrical ground the generalized action formalism can be useful, for example, for deriving component actions of supersymmetric models for which actions have been unknown.

The generalized actions have been constructed for the ordinary super–p–branes [72, 150], the super–D–branes [197, 75] and (implicitly) for so called L–branes [198] whose physical modes form linear supermultiplets. For the M5–brane the generalized action which extends the Green–Schwarz-type action (5.3) to the worldvolume superspace and which produces the superembedding conditions is still unknown because of problems caused by the presence of the self–dual field.

For further details on the generalized action approach to superfield theories we refer the reader to original literature [73, 72, 197, 78, 150, 75, 70].

6.2 D–branes, L–branes and branes ending on branes

We have already mentioned that the superembedding approach is applicable to the description of all known superbranes, including the Dirichlet branes [50, 197, 75], and it has also been used to derive equations of motion and actions for a class of branes called L–branes [50, 198] which contain on their worldvolumes antisymmetric gauge fields dual to worldvolume scalars or vectors.

As in the case of the M5–brane the worldvolume gauge fields of the D–branes and L–branes (or more precisely their field strengths) show up in the superembedding condition (4.49) as the spin–tensor field $h_{\alpha q}^{\alpha'}(z)$. The analysis of the superembedding integrability conditions involving $h_{\alpha q}^{\alpha'}$ is made along the lines explained with the example of the M5-

brane and reveals the Born–Infeld structure of equations of motion of the gauge fields.

L–branes can be obtained, by dualizing vector fields of Dp–brane actions [199, 158, 177, 207], and from standard super–p–branes by a direct dimensional reduction of the target superspace and the dualization of worldvolume scalars, corresponding to compactified dimensions, into rank $p-1$ antisymmetric fields, which enter the linear supermultiplet of the supersymmetric worldvolume field theory.

In some cases, when, for example, there are eight supersymmetries in the worldvolume, the scalar supermultiplets are on the mass shell, while the corresponding dual linear supermultiplets are off–shell, and the L–branes admit the off-shell worldvolume superfield description [198].

In the superembedding approach L–branes naturally appear when for a given super-surface and target superspace the basic superembedding condition yields the superfield constraint of the linear supermultiplet [50]. The L–brane duals of D-branes also occur when one considers Dp–branes ending on D(p+2)–branes [74].

The consideration of open branes ending on another (host) branes from the point of view of superembedding is an interesting problem of its own, as, for instance, studying an M2–brane ending on an M5–brane. The investigation of such brane configurations has been carried out in [74], where it has been demonstrated that the basic principles of superembedding work perfectly well also in these cases. It has been shown that if the constraints on the superworldvolume of the open brane are imposed, the superembedding conditions determine the superworldvolume constraints for the host branes, and provide one with information about the dynamics of the boundary of the open brane in the host brane.

For further details we refer the reader to the original literature cited above.

6.3 Nonlinear realizations and superembeddings

We have already discussed that the presence of the superbranes in the target superspaces (partially) breaks supersymmetry of the background vacuum. This supersymmetry breaking is spontaneous, since the worldvolume equations of motion of the superbrane are manifestly invariant under target–space supersymmetry, while their (classical vacuum) solutions preserve only a fraction of the supersymmetry transformations.

The superbrane configurations whose worldvolume actions possess κ–symmetry, with the number of independent parameters being half the number of target–space supersymmetries, include BPS states which preserve half the supersymmetry.

An effective group–theoretical and geometrical method to describe theories with spontaneously broken symmetries is the method of nonlinear realizations of symmetries (or the coset space approach) which is based on the Cartan theory of group manifolds and coset spaces.

For the first time this method was applied in physics to the construction of phenomenological Lagrangians of particle interactions by Callan, Coleman, Wess and Zumino [200], and independently by Volkov [201]. It was then used for the construction of the first globally supersymmetric field theory [202] and supergravity [203].

Since branes naturally provide us with a geometrical mechanism of partial (super)symmetry breaking (which is nothing but the Goldstone–Higgs mechanism), it is natural to apply to the description of the field theory on the worldvolume of the brane the method of nonlinear realizations.

This has been done in a number of papers.

A super–3–brane in $N = 1$, $D = 6$ superspace as a model of partial spontaneous $n = 2$ supersymmetry breaking in $d = 4$ was considered in [204, 205].

An $N = 1$, $D = 4$ supermembrane and $N = 2$, $D = 2$ superparticles were discussed in [206].

In the static gauge a worldvolume $n = 1$ superfield Born–Infeld–type action for the D3–brane in $N = 2$, $D = 4$ superspace was first constructed in [71] as the nonlinear action of the Goldstone–Maxwell supermultiplet for partially broken $N = 2$ supersymmetry. And the gauge fixed superfield action for its dual L3–brane was derived in [207].

The formalism of partial supersymmetry breaking has been further developed in application to branes in superstring and M–theory in [208, 209, 210, 211].

Because of its nature, this method is applicable to the description of (super)branes propagating in the backgrounds with isometries, which have the geometry of coset (super)spaces, such as flat superspace or anti–de–Sitter superspaces. For instance, in the framework of the AdS/CFT (superconformal field theory) correspondence [212], the coset space approach has been used to get the explicit form of the supervielbeins of $AdS_{p+2} \times S^{D-p-2}$ superspaces and to construct gauge fixed superconformal actions for superstrings [176, 213, 216], a D3–brane [176, 214, 216] and M–branes [176, 215, 216] propagating in these superbackgrounds.

As a simple example of the use of the method of nonlinear realizations let us consider a supermembrane in $N = 1$, $D = 4$ flat superspace parametrized by coordinates $X^{\underline{a}}$ and $\Theta^{\underline{\alpha}}$ ($\underline{a} = 0, 1, 2, 3$; $\underline{\alpha} = 1, 2, 3, 4$). From the point of view of the worldvolume field theory this is the model of spontaneous breaking $n = 2$, $d = 3$ supersymmetry down to $n = 1$ [206, 210].

The flat superspace is associated with the coset (actually supergroup) manifold of the $N = 1$, $D = 4$ translations whose element can be exponentially parametrized as

$$K(X, \Theta) = e^{i(X^{\underline{a}} P_{\underline{a}} + \Theta^{\underline{\alpha}} \underline{Q}_{\underline{\alpha}})}, \tag{6.3}$$

where $P_{\underline{a}}$ and $\underline{Q}_{\underline{\alpha}}$ are the supertranslation generators

$$\{\underline{Q}_{\underline{\alpha}}, \underline{Q}_{\underline{\beta}}\} = 2i P_{\underline{a}} (C\Gamma^{\underline{a}})_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}}, \quad [\underline{Q}_{\underline{\alpha}}, P_{\underline{a}}] = 0. \tag{6.4}$$

The coset element (6.3) can be multiplied by the Lorentz–group coset matrix $U = \frac{SO(1,3)}{SO(1,2)}$ [208, 210], which corresponds to the harmonic matrices (4.11) and (4.44) of the superembedding approach.

The Cartan one–form $K^{-1}dK$ takes its values in the superalgebra (6.4) and yields the supervielbeins of the superspace under consideration

$$\frac{1}{i}K^{-1}dK = \mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}P_{\underline{a}} + \mathcal{E}^{\underline{\alpha}}\underline{Q}_{\underline{\alpha}}, \tag{6.5}$$

where

$$\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}} = dX^{\underline{a}} - id\bar{\Theta}\Gamma^{\underline{a}}\Theta, \quad \mathcal{E}^{\underline{\alpha}} = d\Theta^{\underline{\alpha}}. \tag{6.6}$$

In the superembedding approach we have considered the pullbacks $\mathcal{E}^{\underline{A}}(Z(z))$ of the supervielbeins (6.6) onto the supermembrane worldvolume parametrized by coordinates $z = (\xi^a, \eta^\alpha)$ $(a = 0, 1, 2;\ \alpha = 1, 2)$, and imposed the superembedding condition $\mathcal{E}^{\underline{a}}_{\alpha} = 0$ to specify the embedding corresponding to the dynamics of the brane.

In the method of nonlinear realizations one, from the beginning, (i.e. already in (6.3)) identifies part of the superspace coordinates $X^{\underline{a}}$ and $\Theta^{\underline{\alpha}}$ with the superworldvolume coordinates ξ^a and η^α

$$\xi^a = X^a\ (a = 0, 1, 2), \quad \eta = (1 + \Gamma^{012})\Theta. \tag{6.7}$$

The corresponding supertranslations P_a and $Q = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \Gamma^{012})\underline{Q}$ generate $n = 1$, $d = 3$ supersymmetry which remains unbroken in the superworldvolume of the brane.

The coordinates $X^3(\xi, \eta)$ and $\theta(\xi, \eta) = (1 - \Gamma^{012})\Theta$ transverse to the brane are associated with the Goldstone superfields of spontaneously broken supertranslations generated by P_3 and $S = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \Gamma^{012})\underline{Q}$.

Thus, from the perspective of the $n = 2$, $d = 3$ worldvolume field theory the $N = 1$, $D = 4$ superalgebra (6.4) looks as

$$\{Q_\alpha, Q_\beta\} = 2P_a\gamma^a_{\alpha\beta}, \quad \{S_\alpha, S_\beta\} = 2P_a\gamma^a_{\alpha\beta}, \quad \{Q_\alpha, S_\beta\} = 2\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}P_3, \tag{6.8}$$

where P_3 plays the role of the central charge.

The Goldstone superfields $X^3(\xi, \eta)$ and $\theta(\xi, \eta)$ are then subject to constraints which should reduce the number of their components to a suitable irreducible supermultiplet. (Such constraints can be found, for instance, with the help of a so called "inverse Higgs" effect [217]). In the case under consideration the constraint is

$$D_\alpha X^3 = \theta_\alpha, \tag{6.9}$$

which singles out a scalar $n = 1$, $d = 3$ supermultiplet describing physical degrees of freedom of the supermembrane.

In some cases [205]–[211] the constraints can be solved in terms of superfields which can be used to construct nonlinear actions.

Comparing this formalism with the superembedding approach we see that the choice (6.7) of the superbrane coordinates is nothing but the static gauge, which can be chosen in the superembedding approach to fix worldvolume superdiffeomorphisms, and the constraint (6.9) imposed on the Goldstone superfields is similar to the superembedding condition (5.47), (5.51).

Thus, the method of the nonlinear realizations can be regarded as a gauge fixed version of the covariant superembedding description of superbranes, which can provide us with a way of explicit solving for the superembedding constraints and with an alternative method to construct (gauge fixed) superbrane actions.

A detailed analysis of the relation between the two approaches in different cases is an interesting subject for future study.

7 Concluding remarks and outlook

We have given an introduction to generic features of the geometrical approach to the description of the theory of superbranes.

This powerful approach unifies on the grounds of supersurface theory various formulations of supersymmetric extended objects, such as the Green–Schwarz, twistor and Lorentz–harmonic formulation, and the method of nonlinear realizations.

Being manifestly supersymmetric in the worldvolume and in the target space, this approach also establishes (at the classical level) the link between spinning particles and superparticles, and between Neveu–Schwarz–Ramond and the Green–Schwarz superstrings.

Superembedding explains the nature of the κ–symmetry of the Green–Schwarz–type actions as odd superdiffeomorphisms (local supersymmetry) of the superbrane worldvolume.

These properties of superembeddings allow one, in certain cases, to overcome the covariant quantization problem of superparticles and superstrings.

As we have seen, in many cases the basic superembedding condition contains the full information about the dynamics of the superbrane, i.e. it produces the superbrane equations of motion. This is of particular importance for the description of new objects for which the use of other methods may encounter problems.

Depending on whether or not the superembedding condition puts the superbrane on the mass shell, the approach gives a recipe for the construction of component, generalized or superfield actions of the superbranes by the use of a closed $(p+1)$–superform which exists in the brane superworldvolume.

As further applications of the superembedding approach, one may use it to search for new types of (dual) families of branes, study superembeddings which correspond to brane configurations preserving less than half target–space supersymmetry, as intersecting branes, carry out more detailed analysis of the relation between the superembedding

approach and the method of nonlinear realizations, and to use it for studying the dynamics of branes and gauge fixed brane actions in AdS superbackgrounds in connection with the AdS/CFT correspondence conjecture.

Acknowledgements

The author is grateful to J. Bagger for the suggestion to write down this article and to N. Berkovits, S. Krivonos, P. Pasti, C. Preitschopf, H. Skarke and M. Tonin for interest to this work, useful discussions and comments, and especially to I. Bandos, F. Bettella and D. Smith for reading the manuscript and numerous discussions which helped the author to make some points more transparent. The author acknowledges the financial support from the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation. This work was also partially supported by the European Commission TMR Programme ERBFMPX-CT96-0045 to which the author is associated, by the INTAS Grant 96-308 and under the project N 2.5.1/52 of the Ukrainian State Committee on Science and Technology.

References

[1] M. Green, J. Schwarz and E. Witten, *Superstring Theory*, CUP, 1987.

[2] D. Lüst and S. Theisen, *Lectures on String Theory*, Lecture notes in physics 346, Berlin etc., Springer (1989) 346 p.

[3] J. Polchinski, String Theory, Cambridge University Press, 1998.

[4] F. Lund and T. Regge, *Phys. Rev.* **D14** (1976) 1524.

[5] R.Omnes, *Nucl. Phys.* **B149** (1979) 269.

[6] B. M. Barbashov and V. V. Nesterenko, *Relativistic string model in hadron physics*, Moscow, Energoatomizdat, 1987.
Introduction to relativistic string theory, Singapore, World Scientific (1990) 249 p.

[7] S. Kobayashi and K. Nomizu, *Foundations of Differential Geometry*, vol. II, Wiley Interscience, 1963;
L. Eisenhart, *Riemannian Geometry*", Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1964;
Dubrovin, Novikov and Fomenko, *Modern Geometry*, Mir, Moscow, 1987.

[8] A. Zheltukhin, *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. (Yadern.Fiz.)* **33** (1981) 1723 ; *Theor. Mat. Phys.* **52** (1982) 73 ; *Phys. Lett.* **B116** (1982) 147; *Theor. Mat. Phys.* **56** (1983) 230.

[9] E. Bergshoeff, E. Sezgin and P. K. Townsend, *Phys. Lett.* **189B** (1987) 75; *Ann. of Phys.* **185** (1988) 330.

[10] R. Güven, *Phys. Lett.* **B276** (1992) 49.

[11] J. Dai, R. G. Leigh and J. Polchinski, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A4** (1989) 2073;
R. G. Leigh, Mod. *Phys. Lett.* **A4** (1989) 2767.

[12] J. Polchinski, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75** (1995) 4724.

[13] J. H. Schwarz, *Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl.* **55B** (1997) 1;
P. K. Townsend, *Four Lectures on M-theory*, hep–th/9612121;
A. Sen, *An Introduction to Non-perturbative String Theory*, hep-th/9802051.

[14] A. Sen, *Developments in Superstring Theory*, hep-ph/9810356.

[15] J. H. Schwarz, *Introduction to M Theory and AdS/CFT Duality*, hep-th/9812037.

[16] P. K. Townsend, *Phys. Lett.* **B350** (1995) 184;
E. Witten, *Nucl. Phys.* **B443** (1995) 85;
J. H. Schwarz, *Phys. Lett.* **B367** (1996) 97;
P. Horava and E. Witten, NPB 460 1996 506.

[17] J. Hoppe, *Phys. Lett.* **B250** (1990) 44;
M. Bordemann and J. Hoppe, *Phys. Lett.* **B317** (1993) 315; *Phys. Lett.* **B325** (1994) 359.

[18] A. L. Larsen and N. Sánchez, *Phys. Rev.* **D54** (1996) 2801.

[19] I. Bakas and K. Sfetsos, *Phys. Rev.* **D54** (1996) 3995.

[20] I. Bandos, E. Ivanov, A. Kapustnikov, S. Ulanov, *General Solution of String Inspired Nonlinear Equations*, hep-th/9810038.

[21] I. Bandos, D. Sorokin and D. Volkov, *Phys. Lett.* **B372** (1996) 77 (hep–th/9510220).

[22] D. Sorokin and F. Toppan, *Nucl. Phys.* **B480** (1996) 457; *Letters in Math. Phys.* **42** (1997) 139.

[23] A. N. Redlich and H. Schnitzer, *Phys. Lett.* **B167** (1986) 315.
D. Gepner and E. Witten, *Nucl. Phys.* **B278** (1986) 493.
J. Balog, L. O'Raighfertaigh, P. P. Forgács and A. Wipf, *Nucl. Phys.* **B325** (1989) 225.
I. Bars and D. Nemeshansky, *Nucl. Phys.* **B348** ((1991)) 89.
I. Bars, *Phys. Rev.* **D53** (1996) 3308.

[24] E. Witten, *Phys. Rev.* **D44** (1991) 314.
I. Bars and K. Sfetsos, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A 7** (1992) 1091; *Phys. Rev.* **D46** (1992) 4495.
P. Ginsparg and F. Quevedo, *Nucl. Phys.* **B385** (1992) 527.
C. Kounnas and D. Lüst, *Phys. Lett.* **B289** (1992) 56.
A. Giveon, E. Rabinovici and A. A. Tseytlin, *Nucl. Phys.* **B409** (1993) 339.
K. Sfetsos and A. A. Tseytlin, *Nucl. Phys.* **B415** (1994) 116.
E. Ragoucy, A. Sevrin and P. Sorba,*Commun. Math. Phys.* **181** (1996) 91.

[25] L. Fehér, L. O'Raifeartaigh, P. Ruelle, I. Tsutsui and A. Wipf, *Phys. Reports* **222** (1992) 1.

[26] M.B. Halpern, E. Kiritsis, N.A. Obers and K. Clubok, *Phys. Reports* **265** (1996) 1.

[27] D. Sorokin, V. Tkach and D. V. Volkov, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A4** (1989) 901.

[28] N. Berkovits, *Phys. Lett.* **232B** (1989) 184.

[29] N. Berkovits, *Phys. Lett.* **241B** (1990) 497.

[30] N. Berkovits, *Phys. Lett.* **B247** (1990) 45; *Nucl. Phys.* **B350** (1991) 193.

[31] D. P. Sorokin, *Fortshr. Phys.* **38** (1990) 923.

[32] P. S. Howe and P. K. Townsend, *Phys. Lett.* **B259** (1991) 285.

[33] M. Tonin, *Phys. Lett.* **B266** (1991) 312; *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A7** 1992 6013.

[34] E. Ivanov and A. Kapustnikov, *Phys. Lett.* **B267** (1991) 175; *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A7** (1992) 2153.

[35] J. P. Gauntlett, *Phys. Lett.* **B272** (1991) 25.

[36] F. Delduc and E. Sokatchev, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **9** (1992) 361.

[37] F. Delduc, E. Ivanov and E. Sokatchev, *Nucl. Phys.* **B384** (1992) 334.

[38] A. Pashnev and D. Sorokin, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **10** (1993) 625.

[39] A. Galperin and E. Sokatchev, *Phys. Rev.* **D46** (1992) 714.

[40] F. Delduc, A. Galperin, P. Howe and E. Sokatchev, *Phys. Rev.* **D47** (1992) 587.

[41] V.Chikalov and A.Pashnev, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A8** (1993) 285.

[42] A. Galperin and E. Sokatchev, *Phys. Rev.* **D48** (1993) 4810.

[43] P. Pasti and M. Tonin, *Nucl. Phys.* **B418** (1994) 337.

[44] E. Bergshoeff and E. Sezgin, *Nucl. Phys.* **B422** (1994) 329.

[45] I. Bandos, P. Pasti, D. Sorokin, M. Tonin and D. Volkov, *Nucl. Phys.* **B446** (1995) 79.

[46] D. V. Volkov and A. Zheltukhin, *Sov. Phys. JETP Lett.* **48** (1988) 61; *Letters in Math. Phys.* **17** (1989) 141; *Nucl. Phys.* **B335** (1990) 723.

[47] D. Sorokin, V. Tkach, D. V. Volkov and A. Zheltukhin, *Phys. Lett.* **B216** (1989) 302.

[48] S. Aoyama, P. Pasti and M. Tonin, *Phys. Lett.* **B283** (1992) 213.

[49] N. Berkovits, *Nucl. Phys.* **B420** (1994) 332, *Nucl. Phys.* **B431** (1994) 258.

[50] P. S. Howe and E. Sezgin, *Phys. Lett.* **B390** (1997) 133.

[51] P. S. Howe and E. Sezgin, *Phys. Lett.* **B394** (1997) 62.

[52] P. S. Howe, E. Sezgin and P. C. West, *Phys. Lett.* **B399** (1997) 49.

[53] I.A. Bandos and A.A. Zheltukhin, *JETP. Lett.* **54** (1991) 421;
Phys. Lett. 1992 **B288** 77;
Phys. Part. Nucl. **25** (1994)453.

[54] N. Berkovits, *Nucl. Phys.* **B358** (1991) 169; *Ibid* **B379** (1992) 96; *Ibid* **B420** (1994) 332.

[55] D. Polyakov, *Nucl. Phys.* **B449** (1995) 159; *Nucl. Phys.* **B485** (1997) 128.

[56] V. I. Ogievetsky and E. S. Sokatchev, *Phys. Lett.* **B79** (1978) 222; *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. (Yadern.Fiz.)* **28** (1978) 1631, Ibid. **31** (1980) 264, 821.
A. S. Schwarz, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **87** (1982) 37; A. A. Roslyi and A. S. Schwarz, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **95** (1984) 161; *Commun. Math. Phys.* **96** (1984) 285.

[57] A. Neveu and J. H. Schwarz, *Nucl. Phys.* B31 (1971) 86;
P. Ramond, *Phys. Rev.* **D3** (1971) 2415.

[58] M. Green and J. Schwarz, *Nucl. Phys.* **B243** (1984) 285.

[59] F. Gliozzi, J. Scherk and D. Olive, *Phys. Lett.* **65B** (1976) 282.

[60] J. De Azcarraga and J. Lukierski, *Phys. Lett.* **B113** (1982) 170; *Phys. Rev.* **D28** (1983) 1337.

[61] W. Siegel, *Phys. Lett.* **B128** (1983) 397.

[62] M. Cederwall, A. von Gussich, B. E. W. Nilsson, A. Westerberg, *Nucl. Phys.* **B490** (1997) 163;
M. Cederwall, A. von Gussich, B. E. W. Nilsson, P. Sundell and A. Westerberg, *Nucl.Phys.* **B490** (1997) 179;
M. Aganagic, C. Popescu, J.H. Schwarz, *Phys. Lett.* **B393** (1997) 311;
E. Bergshoeff, P.K. Townsend, *Nucl.Phys.* **B490** (1997) 145.

[63] I. Bandos, K. Lechner, A. Nurmagambetov, P. Pasti, D. Sorokin and M. Tonin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78** (1997) 4332.

[64] M. Aganagic, J. Park, C. Popescu and J. H. Schwarz, *Nucl. Phys.* **B496** (1997) 191.

[65] E. Bergshoeff, R. Kallosh, T. Ortin and G. Papadopoulos, *Nucl. Phys.* **B502** (1997) 149;
R. Kallosh, *Phys. Rev.* D56 (1997) 3515.

[66] S. J. Gates Jr. and H. Nishino, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **3** (1986) 391.
J. Kowalski-Glikman, *Phys. Lett.* **B180** (1986) 358.
R. Brooks, F. Muhammed and S. J. Gates Jr. *Class. Quantum Grav.* **3** (1986) 745.

[67] J. Kowalski-Glikman, J. W. van Holten, S. Aoyama and J. Lukierski *Phys. Lett.* **B201** (1987) 487.
A. Kavalov and R. L. Mkrtchyan. Spinning superparticles. Preprint Yer.PhI 1068(31)-88, Yerevan, 1988 (unpublished).

[68] R. Brooks. *Phys. Lett.* **B186** (1987) 313;
J. M. L. Fisch, *Phys. Lett.* **B219** (1989) 71;
A. Galajinsky and O. Lechtenfeld, Towards a stringy extension of self-dual super Yang-Mills, hep-th/9903149.

[69] I. Bandos, A. Maznytsia and D. Sorokin, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A14** (1999) 1975.

[70] P. S. Howe, O. Raetzel and E. Sezgin, JHEP 9808 (1998) 01.

[71] J. Bagger and A. Galperin, *Phys. Rev.* **D55** (1997) 1091.

[72] I. Bandos, D. Sorokin and D. Volkov, *Phys. Lett.* **B352** (1995) 269.

[73] Y. Ne'eman and T. Regge, *Phys. Lett.* **B74** (1978) 54, *Rivista del Nuovo Cim.* 1 1978 1;
R. D'Auria, P. Frè and T. Regge, *Rivista del Nuovo Cim.* 3 1980 1;
L. Castellani, R. D'Auria, P. Frè. "Supergravity and superstrings, a geometric perspective", World Scientific, Singapore, 1991 (and references therein).

[74] C. S. Chu and E. Sezgin, JHEP **9712** (1997) 001. C. S. Chu, P. S. Howe and E. Sezgin, *Phys. Lett.* **B428** (1998) 59. C. S. Chu, P. S. Howe, E. Sezgin and P. C. West, *Phys. Lett.* **B429** (1998) 273.

[75] V. Akulov, I. Bandos, W. Kummer and V. Zima, *Nucl. Phys.* **B527** (1998) 61.

[76] R. Penrose, *J. Math. Phys.* **8** (1967) 345; *Rep. Math. Phys.* **12** (1977) 65;
R. Penrose and M.A.H. MacCallum, *Phys.Rep.* **6** (1972) 241;
R. Penrose and W. Rindler, *Spinors and Space–Time*, V.1,2. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1986.

[77] A. Ferber, *Nucl. Phys.* **B132** (1977) 55.

[78] I. Bandos, P. Pasti, D. Sorokin and M. Tonin, *Superbrane Actions and Geometrical Approach*, D. V. Volkov Memorial Volume, *Lecture notes in physics*, Vol. 509, p. 79. Springer–Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg 1998.

[79] P. S. Howe, E. Sezgin and P. C. West, *Aspects of Superembeddings*, D. V. Volkov Memorial Volume, *Lecture notes in physics* , Vol. 509, p. 64, Springer–Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg 1998.

[80] T. Shirafuji, *Progr. Theor. Phys.* **70** (1983) 18.

[81] A.K.H. Bengtsson, I. Bengtsson, M. Cederwall and N. Linden, *Phys. Rev.* **D36** (1987) 1766;
I.Bengtsson and M.Cederwall, *Nucl. Phys.* **B302** (1988) 104;
M.Cederwall, *Phys. Lett.* **B226** (1989) 45.

[82] Y. Eisenberg and S. Solomon, *Nucl. Phys.* **B309** (1988) 709; *Phys. Lett.* **B220**, 562 (1989).

[83] M. S. Plyushchay, *Phys.Lett.* **B240** (1990) 133.

[84] A. Gumenchuk and D. Sorokin, *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **51** (1990) 350.

[85] I. Bandos, A. Nurmagambetov, D. Sorokin and D. Volkov, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **12** (1995) 1881.

[86] I. Bandos, A. Maznytsia, I. Rudychev and D. Sorokin, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **12** (1997) 3259.

[87] A. Galperin, E. Ivanov, S. Kalitzin, V. Ogievetsky and E. Sokatchev, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **1** (1984) 469; *Class. Quantum Grav.* **2** (1985) 155.

[88] E. Sokatchev, *Phys. Lett.* **B169** (1987) 209; *Class. Quantum Grav.* **4** (1987) 237.

[89] E. Nissimov, S. Pacheva, S. Solomon, *Nucl. Phys.* **B296** (1988) 469; *Nucl. Phys.* **B299** (1988) 183; *Nucl. Phys.* **B297** (1988) 349; *Nucl. Phys.* **B317** (1989) 344; *Phys. Lett.* **B228** (1989) 181;
E. Nissimov and S. Pacheva, *Phys. Lett.* **B221** (1989) 307.

[90] R. Kallosh and M. Rahmanov, *Phys. Lett.* **B209** (1988) 233; *Phys. Lett.* **B214** (1988) 549.

[91] I. A. Bandos, *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **51** (1990) 906; *JETP. Lett.* **52** (1990) 205.

[92] A. Galperin, P. Howe and K. Stelle, *Nucl. Phys.* **B368** (1992) 248.

[93] A. Galperin, F. Delduc and E. Sokatchev, *Nucl. Phys.* **B368** (1992) 143.

[94] I. Bandos and A. Zheltukhin, *JETP. Lett.* **55** (1992) 81; *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A8** (1993) 1081; *Class. Quantum Grav.* **12** (1995) 609.

[95] E. Witten, *Nucl. Phys.* **B266** (1986) 245.

[96] L.-L. Chau, M.-L. Ge, C.-S. Lim, *Phys. Rev.* **D33** (1986) 1056,
L.-L. Chau and B. Milewski, *Phys. Lett.* **216B** (1989) 330.

[97] J. A. Shapiro and C. C. Taylor, *Phys.Rept.* **191** (1990) 221.

[98] L. Brink, M. Cederwall and C. Preitschopf, *Phys. Lett.* **B311** (1993) 76.

[99] P. Claus, M. Gunaydin, R. Kallosh, J. Rahmfeld and Y. Zunger, JHEP 9905 (1999) 019.

[100] P. Claus, J. Rahmfeld and Y. Zunger, A Simple Particle Action from a Twistor Parametrization of AdS_5, hep-th/9906118.

[101] A. Zheltukhin, *Theor. Mat. Phys.* **77** (1988) 1264; *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **51** (1990) 950.

[102] J. A. De Azcàrraga, J. M. Izquierdo and P. K. Townsend, *Phys. Rev.* **D45** (1992) 3321;
P. K. Townsend, *Phys. Lett.* **B277** (1992) 285;
E. Bergshoeff, L. A. J. London and P. K. Townsend, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **9** (1992) 2545.

[103] E. Bergshoeff and P. K. Townsend, *Nucl. Phys.* **B531** (1998) 226;
E. Bergshoeff, D. Sorokin and P. K. Townsend, *Nucl. Phys.* **B533** (1998) 303.

[104] P. Solomonsen, *Phys. Rev.* **D18** (1978) 1868.

[105] L. Brink, S. Deser, B. Zumino, P. Di Vecchia and P. Howe, *Phys. Lett.* **64B** (1976) 435;
L. Brink, P. Di Vecchia and P. Howe, *Nucl. Phys.* **B118** (1977) 76.

[106] F.A. Berezin and M.S. Marinov, *Ann. Phys.* **104** (1977) 336.

[107] V.D. Gershun and V.I. Tkach, *JETP Letters* **29**, 320 (1979).

[108] P. Howe, S. Penati, M. Pernici and P. Townsend, *Phys. Lett.* **B215** (1988) 555.

[109] R. Casalbuoni, *Nuovo Cim.* **33A**, 389 (1976).

[110] A. I. Pashnev and D. V. Volkov, *Theor. Math. Phys.* **44** (1980) 321.

[111] L. Brink and J. Schwarz, Phys. Lett. **100B**, 310. (1981).

[112] P. A. M. Dirac, *Lectures on Quantum Mechanics*, Academic Press, NY 1967.

[113] A. Micovic, M. Roček, W. Siegel, P. van Nieuwenhuizen, J. Yamron and A. Van de Ven, *Phys. Lett.* **B235** (1990) 106;
E. Bergshoeff, R. Kallosh and A. Van Proeyen, *Phys. Lett.* **B251** (1990) 128;
R. Kallosh, *Phys. Lett.* **B251** (1990) 134.

[114] D. Sorokin, V. Tkach and D. Volkov, *Yad. Fiz.* **49** (1990) 844 (Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.).

[115] V. P. Akulov, I. A. Bandos and D. P. Sorokin, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A3**, 1633 (1988).

[116] N. Jacobson, *Basic Algebra I*, W. H. Freeman and Company, San Francisco 1974, pp. 472.

[117] T. Kugo and P. Townsend, **Nucl. Phys. B221** (1983) 357;
P. S. Howe, G. Sierra and P. K. Townsend, **Nucl. Phys. B221** (1983) 331.

[118] M. Gunaydin and F. Gürsey, *J. Math. Phys.* **14** (1973) 1651.

[119] F. Gürsey and C.-H. Tze, *On the Role of Division, Jordan and Related Algebras in Particle Physics*, World Scientific, Singapore, 1996.

[120] P. West, *Supergravity, Brane Dynamics and String Duality*, hep-th/9811101.

[121] M. Cederwall, *J. Math. Phys.* **33** (1992) 388.

[122] P. Nelson and G. Moore, *Nucl. Phys.* **B274** (1986) 509;
P. S. Howe and G. Papadopoulos, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **4** (1987) 11.

[123] J. Wess and J. Bagger, *Supersymmetry and Supergravity*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jerzy, Second Edition, 1992.

[124] S.J. Gates, M. T. Grisaru, M. Rocek and W. Siegel, *Superspace or one Thousand and one Lessons in Supersymmetry*, Frontiers In Physics, 58, Benjamin/cummings 1983, 548 P.

[125] I. L. Buchbinder and S. M. Kuzenko, *Ideas and Methods of Supersymmetry and Supergravity: a Walk Through Superspace*, Bristol, UK: IOP (1995) 640 p.

[126] B.E.W. Nilsson, *Off-shell fields for ten-dimensional supersymmetric Yang–Mills theory*, Preprint ITP, Goteborg, GOTEBORG-81-6, Feb 1981. 7pp (unpublished),
B. E. W. Nilsson, *Class.Quantum Grav.* **3** (1986) L41.

[127] E. Cremmer and S. Ferrara, *Phys. Lett.* **91B** (1980) 61;
L. Brink and P. S. Howe, *Phys. Lett.* **91B** (1980) 384.

[128] B. E. W. Nilsson, *Nucl. Phys.* **B188** (1981) 46.

[129] A. Candiello and K. Lechner, *Nucl. Phys.* **B412** 479.

[130] A. Shild, *Phys. Rev.* **D16** (1977) 1722;
A. Karlhede and U. Lindström, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **3** (1986) L73;
A. P. Balachandran, F. Lizzi and G. Sparano, *Nucl. Phys.* **B263** (1986) 608; *Nucl. Phys.* **B277** (1986) 359.

[131] A. Zheltukhin, *Sov. Phys. JETP Lett.* **46** (1987) 208; *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **48** (1988) 375.

[132] F. Lizzi, B. Rai, G. Sparano and A. Srivastava, *Phys. Lett.* **B182** (1986) 326; *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **1821987376;**
(J.) Gamboa, C. Ramirez and M. Ruiz–Altaba, *Phys. Lett.* **B225** (1989) 335.

[133] I. A. Bandos and A. A. Zheltukhin, *Sov. Phys. JETP Lett.* **51** (1990) 547; *Sov. Phys. JETP Lett.* **53** (1991) 5; *Phys. Lett.* **B261** (1991245;) *Theor. Mat. Phys.* **88** (1991) 358; *Fortsch. der Phys.* (1993) 619.

[134] A. Barcelos-Neto and M. Ruiz-Altaba, *Phys. Lett.* **B228** (1989) 193.

[135] U. Lindström, B. Sundborg and G. Theodoridis, *Phys. Lett.* **B253** (1991) 319; *Phys. Lett.* **B258** (1991) 331.

[136] U. Lindström and R. von Unge, *Phys. Lett.* **B403** (1997) 233.

[137] I. A. Bandos, D. P. Sorokin, M. Tonin and D. V. Volkov, *Phys.Lett.* **B319** (1993) 445.

[138] P. K. Townsend, *Phys. Lett.* **B409** 131.

[139] M. Cederwall and P. K. Townsend, JHEP (1997) 003;
M. Cederwall and A. Westerberg, JHEP 9802 (1998) 004.

[140] M. Tonin, *Twistor–like formulation of Heterotic strings*, Talk at the X Italian Conference on General Relativity and Gravitational Physics, Bardonecchia, 1992, hep–th/9301055.

[141] L. Bonora, P. Pasti and M. Tonin, *Phys. Lett.* **b156** (1986) 191; *Nucl. Phys.* **B261** (1985) 241; *Nucl. Phys.* **286** 150.

[142] I. A. Bandos, M. Cederwall, D. P. Sorokin and D. V. Volkov, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A9** (1994) 2987.

[143] D. J. Gross, J. A. Harvey, E. Martinec and R. Rohm, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **54** (1985) 253; *Nucl. Phys.* **B256** (1986) 253; *Ibid.* **267** (1986) 75.

[144] D. Sorokin and M. Tonin, *Phys. Lett.* **326B** (1994) 84.

[145] P. S. Howe, *Phys. Lett.* **B332** (1994) 61.

[146] E. Ivanov and E. Sokatchev, *Chiral fermion action with (8,0) worldsheet supersymmetry*, hep-th/9406071.

[147] I. Bandos, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A12** (1997) 799;
I. Bandos and W. Kummer, *Poisson sigma–models and embedding approach to* $(p+1)$*–dimensional gravity*, hep-th/9703099, Int. J. Mod. Phys. (in press).

[148] I. Bandos, J. Lukierski, *Tensorial central charges and new superparticle models with fundamental spinor coordinates*, hep-th/9811022, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A**, in press;
I. Bandos, J. Lukierski and D. Sorokin, *Superparticle Models with Tensorial Central Charges*, hep-th/9904109.

[149] M. J. Duff, Ramzi R. Khuri and J. X. Lu, *Phys. Rept.* **259** (1995) 213.

[150] I. Bandos and A. Nurmagambetov, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **14** (1997) 1597.

[151] M. Sohnius, *Nucl. Phys.* **B136** (1978) 461.

[152] N. Dragon, *Z. Phys.* **C2** (1979) 29.

[153] R. Grimm, J. Wess and B. Zumino, *Nucl. Phys.* **B152** (1979) 255.

[154] I. A. Bandos and V. G. Zima, *Theor. Math. Phys.* **70** (1987) 76.

[155] Cremmer, B. Julia and J. Scherk, *Phys. Lett.* **B76** (1978) 409.

[156] M. J. Duff and K. S. Stelle, *Phys. Lett.* **253B** (1991) 113.

[157] O.Aharony, *Nucl. Phys.* **B476** (1996) 470; E. Bergshoeff, M. de Roo and T. Ortín, *Phys. Lett.* **386B** (1996) 85.

[158] P. Pasti, D. Sorokin and M. Tonin, *Phys. Lett.* **398B** (1997) 41.

[159] P. Pasti, D. Sorokin and M. Tonin, *Phys. Lett.* **B352** (1995) 59;
Phys. Rev. **D52** (1995) 4277.

[160] P. Pasti, D. Sorokin and M. Tonin, *Phys. Rev.* **D55** (1997) 6292.

[161] I. Bandos, N. Berkovits and D. Sorokin, **Nucl. Phys. B522** (1998) 214.

[162] M. Perry and J. H. Schwarz, *Nucl. Phys.* **498** (1997) 47;
J. H. Schwarz, *Phys. Lett.* **B395** (1997) 191.

[163] P. S. Howe, E. Sezgin and P. C. West, *Phys. Lett.* **B400** (1997) 255.

[164] I. Bandos, K. Lechner, A. Nurmagambetov, P. Pasti, D. Sorokin and M. Tonin, *Phys. Lett.* **B408** (1997) 135.

[165] O. Baerwald, N. D. Lambert and P. C. West, *On the Energy Momentum Tensor of the M-Theory Fivebrane*, hep-th/9904097.

[166] S. Cherkis and J. H. Schwarz, *Phys. Lett.* **B403** (1997) 225.

[167] L. Bonora, C. S. Chu and M. Rinaldi, JHEP 9712 (1997) 007.

[168] Ph. Brax and J. Mourad, *Phys. Lett.* **B416** (1998) 295.

[169] D. Sorokin and P. K. Townsend, *Phys. Lett.* **B412** (1997) 265.

[170] J. Brodie and S. Ramgoolam, *Nucl. Phys.* **B521** (1998) 139.

[171] J. de Boer, K. Hori, H. Ooguri and Y. Oz, *Nucl. Phys.* **B518** (1998) 173.

[172] P. Claus, R. Kallosh and A. Van Proeyen, *Nucl. Phys.* **B518** (1998) 117.

[173] T. Adawi, M. Cederwall, U. Gran, M. Holm and B. E. W. Nilsson, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A13** (1998) 4691.

[174] J. P. Gauntlett, Joaquim Gomis and Paul K. Townsend, JHEP **9801** (1998) 003.

[175] R. Kallosh, J. Kumar and A. Rajaraman, *Phys. Rev.* **D57** (1998) 6452.

[176] P. Claus, R. Kallosh, J. Kumar, P. K. Townsend and A. Van Proeyen, JHEP **9806** (1998) 004.

[177] M. Abou Zeid and C. M. Hull, *Phys. Lett.* **B428** (1998) 277.

[178] J. Gomis, D. Mateos, J. Simón and P. K. Townsend, *Phys. Lett.* **B430** (1998) 231.

[179] L. Dolan and Ch. R. Nappi, *Nucl. Phys.* **B530** (1998) 683.

[180] D. S. Berman, *Nucl. Phys.* **B533** (1998) 317.

[181] A. Nurmagambetov, *Phys. Lett.* **B436** (1998) 289.

[182] T. Sato, *Phys. Lett.* **B439** (1998) 12; *Nucl. Phys.* **B548** (1999) 231.

[183] C. Grojean and J. Mourad, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **15** (1998) 3397.

[184] K. Lechner, *Nucl. Phys.* **B537** (1999) 361.

[185] P. Claus, *Phys. Rev.* **D59** (1999) 066003.

[186] T. Adawi, M. Cederwall, U. Gran, B. E. W. Nilsson and B. Razaznejad, JHEP **9902** (1999) 001.

[187] J. Gauntlett, C. Koehl, D. Mateos, P. Townsend and M. Zamaklar, *Phys. Rev.* **D60** (1999) 045004.

[188] C. Chryssomalakos, J. A. de Azcárraga, J. M. Izquierdo and J.C. Pérez Bueno, *The geometry of branes and extended superspaces*, hep-th/9904137.

[189] B. A. Ovrut, *N=1 Supersymmetric Vacua in Heterotic M-Theory*, hep-th/9905115.

[190] Ch. Van Den Broeck and K. Van Hoof, *Batalin-Vilkovisky gauge-fixing of a chiral two-form in six dimensions*, hep-th/9905117.

[191] P. S. Howe, N. D. Lambert and P. C. West, *Nucl. Phys.* **B515** (1998) 203;
P. S. Howe, N. D. Lambert and P. C. West, *Phys. Lett.* **B419** (1998) 79.

[192] P. S. Howe, N. D. Lambert and P. C. West, *Phys. Lett.* **B418** (1998) 85;
N. D. Lambert and P. C. West, *Nucl. Phys.* **B524** (1998) 141.

[193] N. D. Lambert and P. C. West, *Phys. Lett.* **B424** (1998) 281.

[194] J. P. Gauntlett, N. D. Lambert and P. C. West, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **202** (1999) 571.

[195] J. P. Gauntlett, N. D. Lambert and P. C. West, *Supersymmetric Fivebrane Solitons*, hep-th/9811024.

[196] N. D. Lambert and P. C. West, *Monopole Dynamics from the M-Fivebrane*, hep-th/9811025.

[197] I. Bandos, D. Sorokin and M. Tonin, *Nucl. Phys.* **B497** (1997) 275.

[198] P. S. Howe, O. Raetzel, I. Rudychev and E. Sezgin, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **16** (1999) 705.

[199] A. A. Tseytlin, *Nucl. Phys.* **B469** (1996) 51;
M. Aganagic, J. Park, C. Popescu amd J. H. Schwarz, *Nucl. Phys.* **B496** (1997) 215.

[200] S. Coleman, J. Wess and B. Zumino, *Phys. Rev.* **177** (1969) 2239;
S. Callan, S. Coleman, J. Wess and B. Zumino, *Phys. Rev.* **177** (1969) 2247.

[201] D. V. Volkov, *Sov. J. Part. Nucl.* **4** (1973) 3.

[202] D. V. Volkov and V. P. Akulov, *JETP Letters* **16** (1972) 438; *Phys. Lett.* **B46** (1973) 109.

[203] D. V. Volkov and V. A. Soroka, *JETP Letters* **18** (1973) 312.

[204] J. Hughes, J. Liu and J. Polchinski, *Phys. Lett.* **B180** (1986) 370;
J. Hughes and J. Polchinski, *Nucl. Phys.* **B278** (1986) 147.

[205] J. Bagger and A. Galperin, *Phys. Lett.* **B336** (1994) 25.

[206] A. Achucarro, J. Gauntlett, K. Itoh and P.K. Townsend, *Nucl. Phys.* **B314** (1989) 129;
J. P. Gauntlett, K. Itoh and P. K. Townsend, *Phys. Lett.* **B238** (1990) 65.

[207] J. Bagger and A. Galperin, *Phys. Lett.* **B412** (1997) 296.

[208] S. Belucci, E. Ivanov and S. Krivonos, *Partial breaking $N = 4$ to $N = 2$: hypermultiplet as a Goldstone superfield*, hep–th/9809190.
S. Belucci, E. Ivanov and S. Krivonos, *Partial breaking of $N = 1$, $D = 10$ supersymmetry*, hep–th/9811244.

[209] F. Gonzalez–Rey, I. Y. Park and M. Roček, *Nucl. Phys.* **B544** (1999) 243;
M. Roček and A. Tseytlin, *Phys. Rev.* **D59** (1999) 106001.

[210] E. Ivanov and S. Krivonos, *Phys. Lett.* **B453** (1999) 237.

[211] S. V. Ketov, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A14** (1999) 501;
Born-Infeld-Goldstone superfield actions for gauge-fixed D-5- and D-3-branes in 6d, hep-th/9812051.

[212] J. Maldacena, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **2** (1998) 231;
S. S Gubser, I. R. Klebanov and A. M. Polyakov, *Phys. Lett.* **B428** (1998) 105;
E. Witten, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **2** (1998) 253.

[213] R. R. Metsaev and A. A. Tseytlin, *Nucl. Phys.* **B533** (1998) 109;
I. Pesando, JHEP **9811** (1998) 002; *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A14** (1999) 343; JHEP **9902** (1999) 007;
R. Kallosh and J. Rahmfeld, *Phys. Lett.* **B443** (1998) 143;
R. Kallosh and A. A. Tseytlin, JHEP **9810** (1998) 016. I. Oda, *Phys. Lett.* **B444** (1998) 127; JHEP **9810** (1998) 015.

[214] R. R. Metsaev and A. A. Tseytlin, *Phys. Lett.* **B436** (1998) 281;

[215] B. de Wit, K. Peeters, J. Plefka and A. Sevrin, *Phys. Lett.* **B443** (1998) 153;
G. Dall'Agata, D. Fabbri, C. Fraser, P. Fré, P. Termonia and M. Trigiante, *Nucl. Phys.* **B542** (1999) 157.

[216] P. Pasti, D. Sorokin and M. Tonin, *Phys. Lett.* **B447** (1999) 251.

[217] E. A. Ivanov and V. I. Ogievetsky, *Teor. Mat. Fiz.* **25** (1975) 164.